R5685-4

Volume 17, Nos. 11 & 12 November-December 1989

FOCUS

The monthly magazine of the Joint Center for Political Studies®

Persistent Racism: A Challenge for the 21st Century

Lightning Strikes Twice

Wilder and Dinkins Win Historic Election Victories by Making Mainstream Appeals and Countering Negative Campaign Tactics

PLUS:

Index to 1989 Issues of *Focus* and *Political TrendLetter*

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Perspective

ISSN 0740-0195

PRICE $1.50

Persistent Racism: A Challenge for the 21st Century

by Eddie N. Williams

Editor's Note: This month's "Perspective" is adapted from an address by the Joint Center's president at a conference on "A Century of Civil Rights Struggle," sponsored by the University of Wisconsin-Madison on November 3, 1989.

The civil rights struggle in America has led to many victories on many battlefields. Yet racism persists. It persists right alongside significant, sometimes dramatic, progress in race relations. The pervasive and insidious nature of racism demands a forceful, comprehensive response on many fronts, beginning with government at all levels. Our experience tells us that the battle requires stable long-term commitments by the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government. In the past, the combined efforts of these authorities have been effective in enforcing anti-discrimination laws and in trying to create new norms of interracial conduct. Unfortunately, during the Reagan administration the federal government largely abandoned its progressive national leadership role.

The Congress, furthermore, has been extremely slow in passing legislation aimed at rooting out the remaining vestiges of racism and at enhancing opportunities for the disadvantaged. We need a recommitted Congress in the front ranks of the struggle to pursue aggressively the goal of creating a society in which race is not an obstacle to achievement. Of course, future efforts toward reaching this goal will also require expanding economic opportunities for black Americans. In fact, eliminating the economic-opportunity gap between blacks and whites is one of the most critical keys to success in the battle against racism.

Another critical key to the success of the struggle is the presidency. The post-war history of race relations clearly illustrates the enormous scope and impact of the presidency as a force for social change. In setting the national policy agenda, in mobilizing Congress and public opinion, and in making judicial appointments, many presidents have used their offices to pursue the national goal of justice and equality.

This was not true of President Reagan. He sought to dismantle and eliminate affirmative action and effective social programs and, in the process, he wreaked enough havoc to damage race relations across the country. The Reaganized Supreme Court, moving with alarming aggressiveness this year, has already issued at least five decisions that have the effect of turning back the civil rights clock and brushing aside hard-won victories. In four cases the Court seriously diminished the rights of minority and women workers by making it far more difficult and costly for them to pursue and win employment discrimination lawsuits under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other statutes. Another decision threatens to undermine or eliminate minority business set-aside programs in state and local government procurement.

Needed: More Sophisticated Activism

Since purposeful and persistent political action is the best way to ensure that government plays a vigorous leadership role in ending racism, the improvement of race relations depends on who we elect to public office and what we, the electorate, demand. There is abundant evidence of this vital link between political action and the pace of change.

As the barriers to black voting disappeared in the South, Southern politicians gradually became attentive and

FOCUS
Copyright © 1989 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc.®
The monthly magazine of the **Joint Center for Political Studies**, 1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 626-3500. The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs. Opinions expressed in signed *Focus* articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Joint Center for Political Studies. *Focus* is published monthly. $15.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.

PRESIDENT/Eddie N. Williams
VICE PRESIDENT/Eleanor Farrar
DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/Kathleen Vander Horst
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION/Brenda Watkins Noel
DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES/Auriel Pilgrim
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH/Milton Morris
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE/Russell Owens

ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, PUBLICATIONS, MEDIA RELATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS/Frank Dexter Brown
ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS/Mark Lloyd
EDITOR, *Focus*/David C. Ruffin
SENIOR EDITOR/Marc DeFrancis
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR/Cheryl Miller
PUBLIC AFFAIRS SPECIALIST/Deborah D. Davis
ASSOCIATE EDITOR/Constance B. Toliver
TRENDLETTER RESEARCHER/Alfred Baltimore
WORD PROCESSOR/Merlinda Caniza Novicio

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wendell Freeland/Attorney at Law, *Chairman*
Andrew F. Brimmer/Brimmer and Company, Inc., *Vice Chairman*
Louis E. Martin/Calmar Communications, *Treasurer*
Bishop John Hurst Adams/Senior Bishop, A.M.E. Church
Robert McCormick Adams/Smithsonian Institution
Norma Asnes/Writer
Lucius J. Barker/Washington University
George L. Brown/Grumman Corporation
Charles U. Daly/John F. Kennedy Library and Museum
Marian Wright Edelman/Children's Defense Fund
Luther Hilton Foster/Alexandria, Virginia
Charles V. Hamilton/Columbia University
Ira C. Herbert/Coca-Cola USA
Bernard Rapoport/American Income Life Insurance Co.
Sharon Percy Rockefeller/WETA Board of Trustees
Eddie N. Williams/Joint Center for Political Studies

Members Emeriti: William B. Boyd, Robert C. Maynard, James D. Wolfensohn

Eleanor Farrar/JCPS, *Secretary to the Board*

responsive to the preferences of blacks. Today, on a number of civil rights issues, many Southern legislators are hardly distinguishable from their colleagues outside the South. The battle over the confirmation of Judge Robert Bork, a Reagan nominee to the Supreme Court, illustrated the power of electoral strength in moving the Congress. It also underscored the power of energized coalitions, for it took the combined efforts of blacks, Jews, Hispanics, organized labor, women, and others to deny Bork Senate confirmation.

The improvement of race relations depends on who we elect to public office and what we, the electorate, demand.

In the future, black political activism must become even more sophisticated in at least three areas: political partisanship, coalition building, and voter participation. As the black vote increases in size and influence, it is becoming the subject of intense scrutiny. Its virtual monolithic support of Democratic presidential candidates in recent years is hotly debated in both the Democratic and Republican parties. Although partisanship is a personal matter, it is increasingly clear that black political influence nationwide might be significantly enhanced in the years to come if black voters would achieve a more balanced partisan alignment.

This debatable proposition is advanced in the face of many arguments about the GOP's indifference to black Americans. We must recall, however, that in the 19th century and through the 1920s, the Democratic party was once considered the party of black oppression and the Republican party as the force of liberation. It was in the 1930s that black Americans and the Democratic party struck a partnership based on mutual self-interest.

Whether in the political arena or in other areas, building and maintaining coalitions based on furthering our enlightened self-interests must become a more prominent part of black political strategy. This means strengthening ties with groups that have been historic allies. It also means forging new links, which are mutually beneficial, with others who share our goals on specific policy issues, whether they are in the Republican party or in the corporate sector.

Another part of our political strategy must be to ensure that blacks register and vote in unprecedented numbers to help elect responsive candidates at all levels of government. In too many instances, black political participation has been disappointingly low. By squandering the principal tool of our political empowerment—the ballot—we leave the advancement of our interests to others.

Half Empty or Half Full?

In pursuit of these strategies—governmental intervention and political action—black Americans have an extraordinary role to play because they bear a disproportionately large share of the burden of racism. That burden is a grim history of oppression and spirit-numbing humiliation and growing evidence of societal indifference.

The high cost of racism to the entire country does not need recounting here. It is worth emphasizing, however, how debilitating a force it is. Some blacks are scarred so deeply by it that they use racism—often real but sometimes imagined—as a rationalization for their failures, even their failure to try to improve their lot. As a consequence, a high toll is paid by blacks, to be sure, but it is a toll that is ultimately paid by society as a whole because every individual failure robs this nation of its vital human resources.

To be sure, we must recognize the external obstacles to black progress when they are present. Some of these obstacles, such as institutional racism, remain formidable. Yet, when one considers the tragedy of the erosion of the self-confidence of so many blacks, one wonders if we ourselves may be contributing to that tragedy. We must question the validity of the old tactic by which blacks emphasize their deficits over their gains, their needs over their achievements, their complaints over their celebrations—a tactic which always portrays our glass as half empty rather than half full. When we confront our youth with negative images, regardless of our intentions, do we help undermine their self-confidence?

What do we have to lose by being positive, by being affirmative, by exuding self-confidence, even as we seek to redress grievances? One answer is that we don't want white folks to know just how much we have accomplished. Perhaps we fear that they might not support our cause any longer. How absurd and ironic. Not only do they know what we have accomplished and what we have failed to accomplish, but some of their disillusionment with the struggle to improve race relations may well have resulted from our own failure to acknowledge our achievements fully. To those whites who have labored to improve race relations, the constant accentuation of the negative may leave them thinking that their past support was in vain.

There is clearly an urgent need to rethink some of our tactics to achieve justice and equality. As we prepare to enter the last decade of this century, we need to recognize our accomplishments and build on them with pride. We need to take maximum advantage of new opportunities and resources. We need to adapt our struggle to the changing times and circumstances.

One is reminded of the poem "The Present Crisis," by the New England poet James Russell Lowell:

> "New occasions teach new duties;
> Time makes ancient good uncouth;
> They must upward still and onward
> Who would keep abreast of truth."

Yes, the civil rights struggle in America has led to many victories on many battlefields. But we must fight on in our continuing quest for justice and equality, and we must wage a relentless battle against the divisive and odious force of racism. ■

Lightning Strikes Twice

Wilder and Dinkins Win Historic Election Victories by Making Mainstream Appeals and Countering Negative Campaign Tactics

by Cheryl Miller

History was made twice on November 7, 1989. Lightning struck in Virginia, where Lieutenant Governor L. Douglas Wilder emerged as the nation's first elected black governor, and again in New York City—the largest and possibly the most ethnically diverse of all American cities—where Manhattan Borough President David N. Dinkins became the first black to take the mayoral seat. Yet the landmark victories of these two Democrats were only the most visible of several ground-breaking elections last November. Black candidates were also elected mayors of three other major cities populated by majority-white constituencies: New Haven, Connecticut; Durham, North Carolina; and, Seattle, Washington. (See *Across the Nation* in this issue.)

The Wilder and Dinkins victories greatly expand the political horizon for blacks holding office and for those with political ambitions, shattering old definitions of what is possible. Posts formerly considered out of the reach of non-white candidates because they required seeking the support of predominantly white electorates may now be viewed differently. By the early 1980s, blacks had saturated practically all elective positions available in majority black jurisdictions. Since then, while the number of black officials has continued to grow, the rate of growth has slowed. The election victories this past November, therefore, may suggest the direction many black candidates must take if they are to claim seats traditionally not won by blacks.

In their political experience and their coalition approach, Wilder and Dinkins represent a growing trend among black politicians. An increasing number of them are becoming viable candidates for top positions by climbing the conventional political ladder. For Dinkins and Wilder, certainly, a strong record of government service has assured progressively higher offices.

The American electorate is not yet colorblind, as a number of surveys attest too well. For example, pre-election polls at various times placed Wilder ahead of his opponent by up to 15 percentage points. Dinkins was said to lead his opponent in voter favor by up to 21 points in pre-election and exit polls. Yet both candidates won by the slimmest of margins. A growing number of black candidates who have run deracialized campaigns and have appealed to mainstream voters, however, have shown that they can capture enough white votes to win major elections even where black voters are in the minority. This mainstream campaigning has been used successfully by five-term Mayor Tom Bradley of Los Angeles and by Congressmen Ronald Dellums (D-Calif.) and Alan Wheat (D-MO). And it may also be used by Andrew Young, who plans to run next year for governor of Georgia.

Dr. Miller, a professor of political science and policy sciences at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, is a visiting scholar at the Joint Center.

Governing the Birthplace of Slavery

The lessons Wilder learned about coalition building during his 19 years in Virginia politics—as state senator from 1970 to 1986 and as lieutenant governor since 1986—were evident in his gubernatorial campaign. A native Virginian, Wilder ran on a "new mainstream" theme, deliberately appealing to a cross-section of the electorate. Given the characteristics of Virginia, the birthplace of American slavery, this strategy was only logical. Virginia is known for its Southern conservative culture and its dominance of registered Republicans over Democrats. Blacks are only 17 percent of its total population.

Wilder's election not only represents a major departure for a Southern state, it broadens the political possibilities for blacks with aspirations to higher office throughout the nation. "This victory in the heart of the old Confederacy proves that by their stance on issues and choice of campaign styles, blacks can obtain high office in predominantly white electoral jurisdictions elsewhere," says Richard Shingles, a visiting scholar at the Joint Center from Virginia Polytechnical Institute. "To the extent he is successful as governor, Doug Wilder will bring closer the day when race will no longer be a significant factor in American politics."

Wilder's own roots are in the civil rights movement and the passage of civil rights legislation. Yet, in the campaign, the lieutenant governor deemphasized race as an issue, running neither on "black issues" nor on civil rights activism. His points of emphasis were inclusiveness, abortion rights, and continuity of leadership. At the same time, Wilder did not abandon his black voter base; during the final months of the race he visited up to seven black churches each Sunday.

Wilder defeated former state attorney general J. Marshall Coleman, a Republican, by a narrow margin: 50.1 percent to 49.9 percent. (Coleman has demanded a recount of the election he lost by under 7,000 votes—but most political observers expect the results to remain unchanged.)

(Continued on page 5)

November-December 1989

JCPS

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Inside This Issue

- **Recent Supreme Court ruling in *Patterson v. McLean Credit Union* has resulted in the dismissal of 96 discrimination complaints.**
- **Wrangling over deceased congressman Mickey Leland's House seat continues.**
- **Congress extends the Defense Department's five percent minority business set-aside program.**
- **National black leaders act to preserve Martin Luther King's spiritual legacy.**
- **Federal Judge Alcee Hastings is convicted by the U.S. Senate and removed from the bench.**
- **Across the Nation looks at mayoral victories of black candidates in Cleveland, Detroit, Durham, New Haven, and Seattle.**

U.S. Courts Abandon Discrimination Claimants

The legacy of RONALD REAGAN'S judicial appointments is being painfully felt as U.S. courts have dismissed 96 pending cases of employment discrimination based on the Supreme Court's *Patterson v. McLean Credit Union* ruling last June, according to a recently released study by the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc. In its 5-to-4 *Patterson* decision, the Supreme Court severely limited the scope of Section 1981 of Title 42 of the U.S. Code enacted by Congress in 1866. Before the June 15 ruling, courts routinely granted claimants relief from on-the-job racial harassment under Section 1981, which grants to all persons "the same right to make and enforce contracts...as enjoyed by white citizens." But in *Patterson*, a High Court majority decided that the statute only applied to the "making" of contracts and so could not be used to redress harassment occurring after an employment contract had been signed.

The Legal Defense Fund reports that between June 15 and November 1, judges dismissed 96 claims of discrimination in 50 separate cases, either on their own initiative or at the request of defendants. Among the cases dismissed:

- **31 claims of racial discrimination in firing**
- **22 claims of racial harassment**
- **16 claims of discrimination in promotions or transfers**
- **8 claims of retaliation**
- **6 claims of discriminatory demotions.**

Civil rights advocates are especially concerned that many of the dismissed claims cannot be litigated later under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, since Title VII only applies to employment discrimination and does not cover harassment or retaliation. Many claimants, they fear, will be left with no further options of redress through the courts.

Legislators on Capitol Hill are drafting bills to overturn *Patterson* and other devastating High Court rulings handed down this year that have weakened citizens' legal protection from discrimination. Meanwhile, the Bush administration's position is that these rulings have *not* made it more difficult for victims of discrimination to seek legal redress. That stance has prompted **ERIC SCHNAPPER,** the principal author of the Legal Defense Fund study, to voice his concern that "the Justice Department isn't reading American court decisions any more but may be reading decisions from the Transvaal [in South Africa]."

Run-off Is Scheduled to Fill Mickey Leland's Seat

Texas State Senator CRAIG WASHINGTON and Houston City Councilman ANTHONY HALL, both black Democrats, were the top vote-getters in a bitterly contested special November 7 nonpartisan election in

Houston to fill the late MICKEY LELAND's 18th Congressional District seat. Washington garnered 41 percent of the vote, and Hall 34 percent. There were nine other candidates in the contest. The seat became vacant when Leland, a six-term congressman, was killed in an August plane crash in Ethiopia while on a famine-relief mission.

Both Hall and Washington are attorneys and have similar records of public service. Washington served in the Texas House of Representatives from 1973 to 1983 prior to his election to the state senate in 1983. In the senate he has advocated minority business set-asides and increased minority representation on state boards and commissions. Washington had been endorsed by Councilman **RODNEY ELLIS**, a former congressional aide and close friend of Leland's. Many local political observers were surprised when Ellis did not run for the post himself; he has indicated, however, that he is "more interested in being mayor of Houston at some future date than in running for Congress."

Hall served in the Texas House of Representatives from 1973 to 1977 and ran unsuccessfully against Leland for the 18th district seat in the 1978 Democratic primary election. He has served on the city council since 1979 and in 1983 became the first black council member to win an at-large seat in Houston. Hall is also a proponent of set-aside programs for minorities and women and has drafted anti-apartheid ordinances that have been adopted by the Houston City Council. A run-off election between Washington and Hall will be held on December 9, 1989.

The 18th district, which is 39 percent black, 27 percent Hispanic, and 34 percent white, includes poor and middle-income black neighborhoods, Latino barrios, and wealthy, conservative white sections. In the aftermath of the mid-1980s oil bust, some of the city's commercial office towers are still vacant, a symbol of the area's lingering economic troubles. But the most pressing problems the next member of Congress must face in the urban district's poorer communities are similar to those confronting other inner cities: unemployment, drugs, and crime.

On another front, poetic justice reigned: BEVERLY CLARK, a practically unknown black university employee, unseated four-term white Houston City Councilman JIM WESTMORELAND, who said during a conversation with reporters that the city's airport should be renamed "Nigger International" instead of being renamed after Mickey Leland, as Rodney Ellis had proposed. Clark, who became the first black woman on the council, won nearly 55 percent of the vote with practically unanimous support from an outraged black community.

Congress Extends Set-Aside Law

Just before recessing for the year, Congress passed an amendment sponsored by Rep. NICHOLAS MAVROULES (D-Mass.) to extend, until FY 1993, the Department of Defense's five-percent minority business set-aside program. Mavroules had the support of black members of Congress who have objected to the Defense Department's failure to comply with the congressionally mandated minority business development program. The original defense set-aside measure, Section 1207 of defense bill PL-99-661, had been sponsored by black representatives **JOHN CONYERS** (D-Mich.) and **GUS SAVAGE** (D-Ill.) and enacted by Congress in 1986. The amendment extending Section 1207 was attached to the $305.5 billion omnibus defense authorization bill (H.R. 2461). Section 1207 has required the Pentagon to set aside five percent of its contracts (with an estimated value of $8 billion per year) for minority businesses. Without the Mavroules amendment, the set-aside provisions would have expired next year on September 30.

Mavroules, who chairs the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Investigations, asserts that enforcement of Section 1207 has been weak from the beginning. "The Pentagon had done nothing to implement the set-aside program for 18 months after it was established," he notes, adding that "at this point, minority participation in Defense contracts is only up to 2.8 percent." A June 1989 Government Accounting Office report, requested by black Congresswoman CARDISS COLLINS (D-Ill.), details the Pentagon's contracting relationship with minority-owned media and advertising companies. The report found, among other problems, that the defense department distorted the dollar value of contracts it awarded to minority firms and exaggerated the participation rate by overcounting minority-owned advertisers. Collins, chair of the Subcommittee on Government Activities and Transportation of the House Government Operations Committee, called for the report after receiving complaints from minority advertising agencies and broadcasters.

Mavroules, Collins, and other members of the Congressional Black Caucus met several times with the CEOs of major defense contractors, including Martin-Marietta, Hughes Aircraft, and Rockwell International, to devise ways to increase subcontracts awarded by such contractors to minority firms. Executives of the three above-named corporations make up the Steering Committee on Small Disadvantaged Business of the Washington, D.C.-based Aerospace Industries Association. **This association has contracted with Conwal, Inc., a Hispanic-owned computer consulting firm in Falls Church, Virginia, to create a database of all the minority firms that contract with its member corporations. The association has also contracted with Florida A & M University's School of Busi-**

ness and Industry to help formulate strategies for expanding defense contractors' work with minority businesses. Mavroules, who believes that the set-aside program is in the public interest, says "we must broaden the nation's industrial base by mainstreaming America's many talented minority entrepreneurs."

Preserving Martin Luther King's Good Name

Responding to a newly released book by former civil rights activist Rev. RALPH DAVID ABERNATHY, titled *And the Walls Came Tumbling Down*, 28 nationally prominent black leaders, including major figures in the civil rights struggle, members of Congress, ministers, and businessmen, sent a telegram to Abernathy on October 8 urging him to disavow certain passages of the book which discuss MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. The telegram reads in part:

"We take particular exception to your personal reconstruction on Martin's last hours on this earth. . . . There are words in this book, particularly in the Memphis section, that are so foreign to your life and to your statements of the last 20 years that we are driven to the conclusion that they were put into your mouth by others who needed a sensational story . . . . we urge you to repudiate immediately those sections that contradict the hundreds of statements and speeches you have made about Martin in the last 20 years."

On October 12, after hearing no clear response from Abernathy, the group issued a public statement to the press, including this assessment:

"The book is riddled with gross inaccuracies and painful distortions. To cite only one example, at least four persons who were in Memphis on April 3-4, 1968—Mayor ANDREW YOUNG, the Reverend JESSE JACKSON, BENJAMIN HOOKS, and BERNARD LEE [all but Lee were signatories to this letter]—have separately reported that they have sharply different memories of Dr. King's last night....There are, in our view, clear indications that sentences and whole sections were written and edited by others."

In the October 12 statement, the group cites Abernathy's "two massive strokes that resulted in major brain surgery" and suggests that people "with ulterior motives" have "apparently tak[en] advantage of this situation to attack not only Dr. King but also the dream he represented." The telegram and public statement were signed by the following:

Bishop John H. Adams
Lerone Bennett
Robert Brown
John Cox
Rep. Ron Dellums
Rep. Walter Fauntroy
Rep. Floyd Flake
Rep. William Gray
Dick Gregory
Dorothy Height
Jesse Hill, Jr.
Rev. Benjamin Hooks
Carole Hoover
Rev. Jesse Jackson
Robert Johnson
Vernon Jordon
Tom Kilgore
Rep. John Lewis
Rev. Joseph Lowery
Parren Mitchell
Rev. Otis Moss
Rev. Joseph L. Roberts
Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth
Rev. Gardner Taylor
C. Delores Tucker
Rep. Alan Wheat
Mayor Andrew Young
Rev. McKinley Young

Senate Removes Judge Alcee Hastings From Federal Bench

Judge ALCEE HASTINGS of Florida was removed from his federal judge seat by the U.S. Senate on October 20, following a two-day impeachment trial. The Senate, voting 69 to 26, found Hastings guilty of conspiracy to accept a bribe.

Hastings, the first black federal district judge in Florida, had been appointed to the bench by President **JIMMY CARTER** in 1979. He became the sixth federal judge in U.S. history to be found guilty of charges by members of the U.S. Senate and be removed from office. Although some of Hasting's supporters have suggested that the charges against him were based on racism, Hastings himself denied that assertion. **He has stated, nevertheless, that because he was acquitted in his federal jury trial in 1983, the impeachment violates U.S. law against double jeopardy. Federal courts have chosen to ignore his claims.**

A two-thirds Senate majority is required to remove a federal official, who must first be impeached (indicted) by the U.S. House of Representatives. In the fall of 1988, the House of Representatives voted 413 to 3 to impeach Hastings on 17 charges. The matter was then sent to the Senate for trial. A special Senate committee heard testimony in the case from July 10 to August 3 of this year.

Across the Nation

CONNECTICUT: State Senator JOHN DANIELS was elected New Haven's first black mayor on November 7 when he beat Republican Alderwoman ROBERTA POOLEY by nearly a two-to-one margin in that city's mayoral election. A five-term state senator, Daniels won the Democratic primary on September 14 by defeating JOHN DE STEPHANO, JR., the party-endorsed candidate, with 59 percent of the vote. It was the first time that a candidate backed by the Italian-American controlled Democratic machine lost a primary in 14 years.

Since blacks constitute only 32 percent of New Haven's population of 126,109, it was essential for Daniels to garner support from nonblack voters. To broaden his base, Daniels campaigned on the platform of "inclusion," promising to bring together the city's diverse neighborhoods. He gained early backing from the Latino community and a multiracial coalition of church ministers, and quickly locked up the 1st Ward, know as the "Yale Ward" because it is made up almost entirely of students and university employees.

Daniels served for 14 years on the New Haven Board of Aldermen before being elected a state senator in 1980. In addition to his tenure as alderman and state senator, Daniels has a wealth of experience in addressing urban problems. **He has served as a National Urban Fellow, as a staff member of the White House Task Force on Small Towns, and as special assistant to the executive director of the Joint Center for Political Studies.**

The city of New Haven now joins Hartford as the second major Connecticut municipality with a black mayor. CARRIE SAXON PERRY (D), the incumbent black female mayor of Hartford, won reelection to a second two-year term this November by defeating Republican **ROSEMARY CARDWELL**, a nurse and health-care professional, with 71 percent of the vote. Blacks make up 34 percent of Hartford's population of approximately 136,000.

MICHIGAN: Democratic Mayor COLEMAN YOUNG was reelected in Detroit, claiming his fifth consecutive mayoral victory at the polls. Challenged for the second time by black accounting firm executive TOM BARROW, also a Democrat, Young's victory was almost a carbon copy of his successful 1985 mayoral race with Barrow who then claimed 39 percent of the vote. This time he claimed about 44 percent. Young was widely considered to be more vulnerable to an upset by Barrow this year because of unfavorable media reports on the 71-year-old mayor's personal life, including a well publicized paternity suit.

Coleman and Barrow survived a crowded and fiercely contested nonpartisan primary of 15 candidates, including **JOHN CONYERS JR.**, one of Detroit's two black congressmen. Barrow was endorsed by both of the city's daily newspapers, the *Detroit News* and *Detroit Free Press*, but he was outspent by Young, who had a war chest of over $5 million and was backed by Jesse Jackson. Ironically, Young had vigorously opposed Jackson's presidential bids in 1984 and 1988.

NORTH CAROLINA: CHESTER JENKINS will become the first black mayor of Durham when he takes office on December 31, 1989. Jenkins, a senior marketing analyst with the GTE South telephone company, is a two-term city councilmember who has served as mayor *pro tempore* for the last six years.

With a strong base of support among the city's blacks, who make up 47 percent of Durham's population of 101,000, Jenkins was pushed over the top in the November 7 mayoral election by a powerful black-white coalition. The Durham Committee on the Affairs of Black People and progressive white organizations such as the People's Alliance and the Durham Voters Alliance mobilized support on his behalf.

The efforts of these groups were crucial since the race turned out to be a struggle between progressive and right-wing forces. Jenkins' opponent was retired businessman NELSON STRAWBRIDGE, a conservative Democrat who headed "Democrats for Helms" during ultra-conservative Senator JESSE HELMS' successful reelection bid in 1984. Strawbridge was backed by Friends of Durham, a well-organized conservative group that had, in earlier campaigns, successfully employed door-to-door canvassing as well as sophisticated mailing and telephone campaign techniques. Jenkins' supporters responded in kind, assuring him victory. Jenkins won 53 percent of the vote in the highest turnout (43 percent) for a municipal election in Durham in 10 years.

OHIO: Democratic State Senator MICHAEL WHITE was elected mayor of Cleveland, making him the first black since CARL STOKES held the post from 1967 to 1971. After an acrimonious campaign, White scored an upset victory on November 7 over black City Council President GEORGE FORBES, who had finished first in the city's October 3 nonpartisan primary.

White, who is 38 years old, displayed political ambitions as early as his college days, when he was the first black student body president of Ohio State University. A former aide of Forbes', White won by a vote of 56 percent to 44 percent in a city that is 45 percent black. Campaigning against busing and calling for a massive hiring of 250 additional city police officers, White received strong support from Cleveland's predominantly white West Side. He also was endorsed by the city's daily newspaper, the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, which wrote that he was "a candidate capable of healing the wounds of racial and regional politics."

Forbes, an attorney with 26 years on the city council (including 16 years as council president), had the support of business and labor groups and popular incumbent Republican Mayor **GEORGE VOINOVICH**, who is stepping down to run for governor. Forbes received 70 percent of the vote from Cleveland's East Side, which is mainly black. He also received the endorsement of the American Nationalities Movement, an association of 35 white ethnic organizations. Nevertheless, this support was not enough to secure a victory for Forbes, whom many whites perceive as quick-tempered and unable to mend Cleveland's racial divisiveness.

WASHINGTON: In the Pacific Northwest, Seattle, a city of 500,000 with a black population of about 10 percent, elected its first black mayor on November 7. Democratic City Councilman **NORMAN RICE** received 54 percent of the vote in defeating Republican City Attorney **DOUGLAS JEWETT**. Although Jewett lost, an initiative he coauthored opposing citywide school busing was narrowly adopted by the voters. **The "Save Our Schools" initiative called for giving city funds to the independently-run Seattle School District if it ended its program of school desegregation through busing. Since Seattle's busing plan was initiated in 1978, public school enrollment has dropped by 20,000 students, bringing the total to 40,000. Rice campaigned in the primary against the initiative, but during the general election he changed his position and offered a plan to end busing over a four-year period.**

The November election was a run-off between Rice and Jewett, who had been the top vote-getters in the 13-candidate nonpartisan September 19 primary. Rice, a former broadcaster and banker who has been a member of the Seattle City Council since 1978, ran unsuccessfully for mayor in 1985 and for Congress in 1988. He benefitted from an endorsement by the city's popular incumbent Mayor **CHARLES ROYER**, who is retiring after three terms.

(Continued from page 4)

The election was marked by an extremely heavy voter turnout (65 percent) which was the highest ever for a non-Presidential election in Virginia. According to Larry Sabato of the University of Virginia, this high turnout, especially among blacks, combined with a substantial lead in urban areas, proved to be "the salvation of Doug Wilder. He got his vote out and that did it." In total, Wilder received 94 percent of the black vote and 40 percent of the white vote. The close competition for supporters came with an enormous price tag—the contest ranks as the most expensive in Virginia's history, with Wilder spending $7 million to Coleman's $10 million.

Posts formerly considered out of the reach of non-white candidates because they required seeking the support of predominantly white electorates may now be viewed differently.

Wilder's platform advocated increased aid for cities to fight drugs and the improvement of the state's transportation networks, but its most audible call was for the preservation of women's reproductive rights. Wilder handled this explosive subject deftly, exposing Coleman's anti-abortion sentiments in an early televised debate. He then framed his own pro-choice position in conservative, libertarian terms, arguing that government does not have the right to intrude into so personal a decision as reproductive choice. This position was communicated through a battery of television ads put together by media consultant Frank Greer. In one of them, Wilder's backdrop was an American flag and Thomas Jefferson's Monticello. His pro-choice position on abortion gave Wilder the crossover support he needed from white female Republicans. Indeed, his abortion stance may have accounted for the 18 percent of the Republican vote he snatched from his GOP opponent.

Wilder, who takes office on January 13, 1990, will be the nation's first black governor since 1873, when Pinckney S. Pinchback, a former slave and officer in the Union Army, was appointed to replace elected governor Henry Clay Warmoth of Louisiana who was being impeached. Pinchback served the 43 days remaining in Warmoth's term.

Among the responsibilities and privileges awaiting Wilder as he enters the statehouse will be the considerable influence—shared with the Democratically-controlled legislature—he will wield in developing a reapportionment plan following the 1990 census. This is particularly significant since the state is projected to gain a Congressional seat after the census count is completed.

Moderation Wins in the Bruised Big Apple

After campaigning on a theme of cooperation and optimism in solving New York City's problems, David Dinkins was elected with the most diverse support of any mayoral candidate in the city's history. Blacks, Hispanics, progressive whites, labor unions, and pro-choice women came together to make Dinkins the city's first black mayor. He began his career as an attorney, served as a state assemblyman (1966-72), president of the New York City Board of Elections (1972-73), and city clerk (1975-85). After three bids for the post he was elected in 1985 as Manhattan borough president, the second most powerful position in the city. As borough president, Dinkins has represented 1.5 million people and been a member of the powerful New York Board of Estimates, which administers the city's budget. On January 1, 1990, he will succeed controversial three-term incumbent Mayor Edward Koch.

Dinkins won the November election by a 50 percent to 48 percent margin over Rudolph Giuliani, U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York since 1983, who ran on a Republican-Liberal ticket. As in the Virginia election, voter turnout, at 55 percent overall, was high for a non-presidential New York City election. In many black precincts it exceeded 65 percent.

The main message of Dinkins' campaign was that he would work to heal the wounds of a city scored by racial tension. (In two New York neighborhoods—Howard Beach and Bensonhurst—black youths were killed by white mobs in separate, racially motivated attacks.)

Dinkins had used the same mild tone and moderate approach to defeat the abrasive Mayor Koch in September's Democratic primary as he used to defeat Giuliani in November. According to Rep. Charles Rangel (D-N.Y.), Dinkins' election "was a victory of hope over fear, of optimism over desperation. It proved that New Yorkers can overcome trials and difficulties and pull together...."

To win, Dinkins had to forge a coalition of the city's many ethnic and racial groups, since blacks make up only 25 percent of the population. He received 91 percent of the black vote, 65 percent of the Hispanic vote, and 27 percent of the white vote (including 35 percent of the Jewish vote). Dinkins also had considerable support in his campaign from the New York City Central Labor Council and its 500 local member unions. The Council represents 1.2 million New York workers.

Dinkins, like many other blacks who have been elected in recent years to run major U.S. cities, will have too few resources to address the tremendous problems he inherits. New York City is projected to have a $1 billion deficit by the end of the 1990 fiscal year next June. The AIDS epidemic, a decaying infrastructure, and high rates of homelessness and drug-related crime also plague the city. However, according to Basil Wilson, associate professor of African American Studies at New York's John Jay College of Criminal Justice, because Dinkins "kept the high road" in the campaign "he is in a much better position to bring the city together...heal some of the wounds that exist in the body politic."

Governing New York, a city of more than seven million people, is an immense challenge for any mayor. And the newly revised city charter, which redistributes some of the power to administer the city's $25 billion budget from the Board of Estimates to the mayor's office, now places even more of the burden to resolve New York's fiscal woes on Dinkins' shoulders. ■

FOCUS

Index to Volume 17
January to December 1989

Article Index

	Month	Page
Business		
American Competitiveness: Seeing the Issue Clearly	May	3
Black Political Empowerment and Economic Advancement	May	5
Congress Extends Set-Aside Law	Nov./Dec.	TL 2
Kweisi Mfume's Business Agenda for the 101st Congress	May	TL 1
Minority Business Performance: A Comparison Among Ethnic Groups	May	3
Supreme Court Overturns Richmond's Minority Set-Aside Program	Jan./Feb.	TL 2
The Supreme Court Threatens Economic Empowerment	July	2
A United Response to *Croson*	May	TL 2
A Voice for the Rural Poor	April	3
Bush Administration Appointees		
Arthur Fletcher to Take Helm of Commission on Civil Rights	May	TL 4
Bush's Bad Start on Appointing Black Judges	June	TL 2
Bush's Black Appointees: Do They Represent a New Vision?	Mar.	TL 2
Conservative Black Judicial Candidate Faces Opposition	Aug./Sep.	TL 2
More Bush Administration Appointments and Nominations	Apr.	TL 3
Charitable Giving/Voluntarism		
The Charitable Appeals Fact Book	April	7
City Volunteer Corps: A Model for the Nation	Oct.	5
National Service: Are Points of Light Enough?	Aug./Sept.	8
Needed: Black Initiative and Government Activism	April	2
Update on National Service Legislation	Oct.	6
Education		
Bush and Education: Much Must Be Done	Jan./Feb.	2
Child Care: Building on What Works	Jan./Feb.	7
Closing the Technology Gap at Black Colleges	Jan./Feb.	5
Death of N.Y.C. Chancellor Exacerbates City's Education Crisis	June	TL 4
Racism on College Campuses	Aug./Sept.	3
Reagan's Blind Eye to Civil Rights	Jan./Feb.	3
Visions of a Better Way: A Black Appraisal of Public Schooling	June	7
Electoral Representation/Partisan Politics		
Black Clout on School Board Threatened by Shifting Demographics	July	TL 2
Congressman Gray Whips Adversity	June	TL 1
Dinkins Wins in New York	Aug./Sept.	TL 1
High Stakes in the Coming Battle Over Redistricting	April	TL 2
How to Run a Better Democratic Campaign in 1992	June	5
Lightning Strikes Twice	Nov./Dec.	4
New DNC Chair—Ron Brown, the Negotiator	Jan./Feb.	TL 1
The Number of Black Elected Officials Rose 5.8% During '88	Oct.	TL 2
Rep. Conyers Wants to Be Mayor of Detroit?	July	TL 3
Retiring Police Chief May Try to Trade Badge for Mayor's Robes in D.C.	July	TL 3
Run-off Is Scheduled to Fill Mickey Leland's Seat	Nov./Dec.	TL 2
What the Census Means in Money and Power	July	7
White Minority Wants to Rewrite Rules	July	TL 2
Employment		
Closed Doors on Capitol Hill	Oct.	7
Falling Behind Despite Employment Gains	April	5
Minorities and Privatization: Economic Mobility at Risk	May	7
Minority Business Performance: A Comparison Among Ethnic Groups	May	3
Federal Policies and Programs		
American Competitiveness: Seeing the Issue Clearly	Mar.	3
Bush and Education: Much Must Be Done	Jan./Feb.	2
Bush's Budget—Hope or Deception?	Jan./Feb.	TL 3
Child Care: Building on What Works	Jan./Feb.	7
Congress Must Return to the People's Business	June	2
Hope for the Homeless	Oct.	3
Housing: Recognizing the Crisis, Taking Action	June	3
Kweisi Mfume's Business Agenda for the 101st Congress	May	TL 1
Mickey Leland's Last Mission	Aug./Sept.	TL 2
National Service: Are Points of Light Enough?	Aug./Sept.	8
Reagan's Blind Eye to Civil Rights	Jan./Feb.	3
Update on National Service Legislation	Oct.	6
A Voice for the Rural Poor	April	3
Health		
Abortion: Whose Issue Is It Anyway?	Aug./Sept.	10
Black Women Take Stand on Reproductive Freedom	Aug./Sept.	TL 2
Housing		
Congress Must Return to the People's Business	June	2
Continuing Mickey's Struggle: Sounding the Alarm	Oct.	2
Hope for the Homeless	Oct.	3
Housing: Recognizing the Crisis, Taking Action	June	3
International Affairs/The Military		
American Competitiveness: Seeing the Issue Clearly	Mar.	3
American Delegation Attends Inauguration of Parliamentary Black Caucus	Apr.	TL 1
Apartheid's Attempted Face-Lift	May	TL 2
Blacks and International Affairs	Mar.	2
Continuing Mickey's Struggle: Sounding the Alarm	Oct.	2
Mickey Leland's Last Mission	Aug./Sept.	TL 2
Out Again—In Again: Manley Is Back in Jamaica	Mar.	TL 1

	Month	Page
The Price of Namibian Independence	Mar.	5
Sen. Hatch Apologizes for Smear Against Randall Robinson	Oct.	TL 1
Who Defends America? Race, Sex, and Class in the Armed Forces	Mar.	7
Witness to Apartheid	Aug./Sept.	TL 3
The Joint Center for Political Studies		
JCPS and WETA Document Urban Teen Crisis	May	8
JCPS Expands Research on Economic Policy	May	2
The 1990 Census		
High Stakes in the Coming Battle Over Redistricting	Apr.	TL 2
The 1990 Census: Counting Everybody	July	5
What the Census Means in Money and Power	July	7
Race Relations/Civil Rights		
Arthur Fletcher to Take Helm of Commission on Civil Rights	May	TL 4
A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society	Aug./Sept.	6
Conservative Black Judicial Candidate Faces Opposition	Aug./Sept.	TL 2
David Duke and the Politics of Race	Mar.	TL 2
On Guard Against Racism	Aug./Sept.	2
Persistent Racism: A Challenge for the 21st Century	Nov./Dec.	2
Racism on College Campuses	Aug./Sept.	3
The Reagan Court: Turning Back the Clock	July	3
Reagan's Blind Eye to Civil Rights	Jan./Feb.	3
The Supreme Court Threatens Economic Empowerment	July	2
U.S. Courts Abandon Discrimination Claimants	Nov./Dec.	TL 1
White Policemen Test High Court's Discrimination Ruling	Oct.	TL 1
Socioeconomic Status		
A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society	Aug./Sept.	6
JCPS Expands Research on Economic Policy	May	2
Prominent Economists Sound the Alarm	July	TL 1
The Supreme Court Threatens Economic Empowerment	July	2
A Voice for the Rural Poor	April	3
The Supreme Court/Affirmative Action		
Abortion: Whose Issue Is It Anyway?	Aug./Sept.	10
Black Women Take Stand on Reproductive Freedom	Aug./Sept.	TL 2
The Reagan Court: Turning Back the Clock	July	3
Supreme Court Overturns Richmond's Minority Set-Aside Program	Jan./Feb.	TL 2
The Supreme Court Threatens Economic Empowerment	July	2
A United Response to *Croson*	May	TL 2
White Policemen Test High Court's Discrimination Ruling	Oct.	

Author Index

Author	Article	Month	Page
Allen, Joyce	Minority Business Performance: A Comparison Among Ethnic Groups	May	3
	The 1990 Census: Counting Everybody	July	5
Bates, Timothy	Black Political Empowerment and Economic Advancement	May	5
Brown, Ronald H., William H. Gray, and Christopher Edley, Jr.	How to Run a Better Democratic Campaign in 1992	June	5
Calhoun, Michael J.	American Competitiveness: Seeing the Issue Clearly	Mar.	3
Cotton, Teri	Abortion: Whose Issue Is It Anyway?	Aug./Sept.	10
DeFrancis, Marc	*The Charitable Appeals Fact Book* (review)	Apr.	7
	A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society (review)	Aug./Sept.	6
	Minorities and Privatization: Economic Mobility at Risk (review)	May	7
	Visions of A Better Way: A Black Appraisal of Public Schooling (review)	June	7
	Who Defends America? Race, Sex, and Class in the Armed Forces (review)	Mar.	7
Dixon, Julian C.	Housing: Recognizing the Crisis, Taking Action	June	3
Espy, Mike	A Voice for the Rural Poor	Apr.	3
Gerber, Jack and David C. Ruffin	National Service: Are Points of Light Enough?	Aug./Sept.	8
Hawkins, Augustus F.	Child Care: Building on What Works	Jan./Feb.	7
Lee, N'Tanya	Racism on College Campuses	Aug./Sept.	3
Leland, Mickey	Hope for the Homeless	Oct.	3
Marchbanks, Jack R.	Closing the Technology Gap at Black Colleges	Jan./Feb.	5
Miller, Cheryl	Lightning Strikes Twice	Nov.Dec.	4
Orfield, Gary	Reagan's Blind Eye to Civil Rights	Jan./Feb.	3
Parker, Jackie	Closed Doors on Capitol Hill	Oct.	7
Richardson, Henry J.III and Lisa Peterson	The Price of Namibian Independence	Mar.	5
Ruffin, David C.	The Reagan Court: Turning Back the Clock	July	3
Schmiegelow, Toni D.	City Volunteer Corps: A Model For the Nation	Oct.	5
Simms, Margaret C.	Falling Behind Despite Employment Gains	April	5
Williams, Eddie N.	Perspective	*	2
	Persistent Racism: A Challenge for the 21st Century	Nov./Dec	2
Williams, Linda F.	What the Census Means in Money and Power	July	7

* monthly column

JCPS Film Producer and Youth Are Honored

Mark Lloyd, Joint Center associate director of communications, was the recipient of a CINE Golden Eagle award in December for his work as producer of the JCPS/WETA documentary, *Turning It Around: Urban Teens in Crisis*. The documentary was chosen by CINE (the Council on International Nontheatrical Events) to represent the best of American film-making at international film festivals.

Turning It Around looks at how four young people coped with challenges commonly confronting youths of today's urban communities. It also examines programs designed to help young people overcome or avoid these problems. Premiered by the Joint Center on Capitol Hill on June 1, the film was produced in cooperation with WETA-TV (Channel 26), Washington, D.C.'s public broadcasting affiliate. It aired on Channel 26 on June 6 and 11.

The documentary, which has been shown at conferences throughout the country, has also helped the youths featured in the film, to "turn their lives around." While Lloyd and Charles Riley, one of the youths featured in the film, presented the documentary in November at the seventh annual conference of the Southern Education Foundation in Atlanta, foundation president Eldridge W. McMillan, after hearing that Charles might not be able to afford to attend college, in a surprise announcement awarded him a four-year college scholarship.

At the age of 14, Charles, a school drop-out, was selling cocaine on the streets of Philadelphia. After repeated run-ins with the local police, he decided to enter the Potomac Job Corps Center in Washington, D.C. Gradually he began to turn his life around, mastering the skills to become a home health aide. Charles graduated from the Job Corps in the spring of 1989 and is now working as a visiting nurse in Philadelphia. He hopes to become a doctor.

Joint Center Releases Two New Publications

Minorities and Privatization: Economic Mobility At Risk, by Robert Suggs, 1989. ($12.50 paper, $25.00 cloth)

The privatization of public services is a growing practice among U.S. municipalities intent on improving efficiency and saving taxpayers' money. In this book, Robert Suggs examines how a variety of privatization schemes carried out between 1981 and 1984 in 10 selected cities affected black and Hispanic residents, workers, and businesses.

Although Suggs finds that privatization results in little loss of employment to minorities in a community, it severely diminishes the quality of jobs available to them. Suggs also finds that minority-owned businesses rarely benefit from the small boost privatization gives the rest of the market economy.

One of Suggs' recommendations is that municipalities require firms which benefit from privatization to give priority in hiring to displaced municipal workers and establish minority procurement programs outside of regular municipal purchasing channels.

A former senior research associate at the Joint Center, Robert Suggs currently teaches at the Arizona State University College of Law.

Black Elected Officials: A National Roster, by the JCPS Office of Research, 1989. ($29.50 paper, $43.50 cloth)

The number of black elected officials in the nation increased by 5.8 percent during 1988 for a total of 7,226, according to the recently released 1989 edition of *Black Elected Officials: A National Roster*. The new total of BEOs represents a significant jump over preceding years (gains were 4.0 and 2.2 percent for 1986 and 1987 respectively) making this the first time since 1985 that the rate of increase has not declined.

The 1989 *Roster*, like earlier editions, identifies black elected officials at all levels of government and includes legislative officeholders, mayors, and city councilmembers, as well as law enforcement judicial, and educational officials. The mailing address and term of office are given for each entry, while tables and graphs allow for quick summary reference

To purchase these publications, write to the Order Department, Joint Center for Political Studies Press, 4720 Boston Way, Lanham, MD 20706; or call 301-459-3366. Make checks payable to UPA, Inc.

FOCUS
Joint Center for Political Studies®
1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3500

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

Postmaster: Form 3547 requested

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify FOCUS of any change of address or title. YOU MUST ATTACH THE MAILING LABEL FROM THE BACK COVER when writing about service or change of address. No change can be made without this information. Allow 6 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

26063
SRI
Acquisitions Editor
Congressional Info Svc, Inc.
4520 East-West Hwy.
Bethesda, MD 20814

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 6958
Washington, D.C.

R5685-4

Volume 18, No. 2 February 1990

FOCUS

The monthly magazine of the Joint Center for Political Studies®

Virginia's Son Celebrates Freedom

America's First Elected Black Governor Envisions a Crime-Free Future With Accessible Education and Affordable Housing

Court Ruling Favors Minority Set-Asides

King County, Washington, Set-Aside Program for Minorities and Women, Revised to Meet the Supreme Court's Croson *Standards, Is Upheld*

Is a New Yardstick Needed to Measure Poverty?

Revisions in the Method of Measuring Poverty Could Mean a Big Change in the Number of Americans Considered Poor, Affecting Eligibility for Social Programs

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Perspective

ISSN 0740-0195

PRICE $1.50

Registration Reform Can Expand the Electorate

As we approach the 25th Anniversary of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, celebrate the release of Nelson Mandela in South Africa, and salute the sweep of democracy through central and Eastern Europe, it is fitting that our own Congress is now considering major reforms to make voter registration more accessible to all Americans. On February 6, 1990, the U.S. House of Representatives passed H.R. 2190, the National Voter Registration Act, with bipartisan support, by a comfortable margin of 289 to 132. A similar bill, S. 874, is pending in the U.S. Senate.

The House bill, affecting only federal elections, contains a "motor voter" provision that allows automatic voter registration when individuals apply for or renew their drivers' licenses. It also would make registration by mail (currently allowed in only half the states) possible in all states and would provide for agency-based registration. The bill would prohibit a practice now allowed in most states, namely purging the rolls of citizens who did not vote in the prior general election. However, states would be required every four years to transfer the names of voters with unverified or inaccurate addresses to an inactive list (but not completely off the rolls).

Proponents of reform argue that many registration systems have served as barriers to voter participation. They maintain that the reforms contained in H.R. 2190 would result in a significant rise in registration rates nationally.

The bill's opponents are concerned about the additional administrative costs of changing current state systems to accommodate new federal procedures. They also cite expanded bureaucracy, the infringement of states' rights to regulate the voting process, and the potential for fraud if the reforms are adopted. But supporters of the bill assert that several states have already instituted efficient, cost-effective registration procedures like those contained in H.R. 2190 with no reported growth in voter fraud.

The National Coalition on Black Voter Participation and its member organizations support the legislation as a step in the right direction, while recognizing it is not a panacea for nonvoting behavior. Mail registration forms that are valid statewide could reduce the number of confrontations between black citizens and biased or recalcitrant registrars as well as lessen the reliance on special deputy registrars to reach unregistered blacks.

Nevertheless, some advocates for minority voters are concerned that while H.R. 2190's "motor voter" provision would succeed in adding middle-class voters to the rolls, its mandatory purge provisions could remove large numbers of low-income citizens who, compared to the general population, vote less often, move more frequently, and are less likely to possess a driver's license.

Therefore, it is important that the bill's mandatory agency-based provisions extend beyond motor vehicle departments to include other state agencies, including welfare offices, public schools, and libraries, that directly serve minority communities. Furthermore, we could not support a registration reform bill that could be interpreted as superceding or limiting any provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended.

The road ahead for reform legislation will be rocky. The Senate bill has yet to generate significant bipartisan support, and the Bush administration has raised the issues of costs and fraud while hinting at a presidential veto. This is unfortunate. At a time when citizens around the world are acknowledging the vitality of democracy, it would be ironic indeed if the Bush administration and members of Congress opposed reasonable efforts to expand the electorate and thereby strengthen democracy in our country. ■

Eddie N. Williams, president of the Joint Center, Sonia R. Jarvis, executive director of the National Coalition on Black Voter Participation, Inc.

FOCUS

Copyright © 1990 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc.® The monthly magazine of the **Joint Center for Political Studies**, 1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 626-3500. The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs. Opinions expressed in signed *Focus* articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Joint Center for Political Studies. *Focus* is published monthly. $15.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.

PRESIDENT/Eddie N. Williams
VICE PRESIDENT/Eleanor Farrar
DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/Kathleen Vander Horst
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION/Brenda Watkins Noel
DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES/Auriel Pilgrim
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH/Milton Morris
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE/Russell Owens

ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS/Mark Lloyd
EDITOR, *Focus*/David C. Ruffin
SENIOR EDITOR/Marc DeFrancis
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR/Cheryl Miller
PUBLIC AFFAIRS SPECIALIST/Deborah D. Davis
ASSOCIATE EDITOR/Constance B. Toliver
TRENDLETTER RESEARCHER/Alfred Baltimore
WORD PROCESSOR/Marlinda Ceniza Novicio

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wendell Freeland/Attorney at Law, *Chairman*
Andrew F. Brimmer/Brimmer and Company, Inc., *Vice Chairman*
Louis E. Martin/Calmar Communications, *Treasurer*
Bishop John Hurst Adams/Senior Bishop, A.M.E. Church
Robert McCormick Adams/Smithsonian Institution
Norma Asnes/Writer
Hannah D. Atkins/Secretary of State, Oklahoma
Lucius J. Barker/Washington University
George L. Brown/Grumman Corporation
Charles U. Daly/John F. Kennedy Library and Museum
Marian Wright Edelman/Children's Defense Fund
Luther Hilton Foster/Alexandria, Virginia
Charles V. Hamilton/Columbia University
Ira C. Herbert/Coca-Cola USA
Elsie H. Hillman/Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Bertram M. Lee, Sr./BML Associates, Inc.
Bernard Rapoport/American Income Life Insurance Co.
Sharon Percy Rockefeller/WETA-TV/FM
Eddie N. Williams/Joint Center for Political Studies

Members Emeriti: William B. Boyd, Robert C. Maynard, James D. Wolfensohn

Eleanor Farrar/JCPS, *Secretary to the Board*

Virginia's Son Celebrates Freedom

America's First Elected Black Governor Envisions a Crime-Free Future With Accessible Education and Affordable Housing

by L. Douglas Wilder

Editor's Note: Following is the inaugural address Governor L. Douglas Wilder delivered on January 13, 1990, at the state capitol in Richmond.

We gather here today for what is both a culmination and a continuation of the democratic process. Four years ago, I stood on this spot to assume the second-highest office in the commonwealth. Today, because of your faith in our efforts, I stand before you as chief executive of this state. And now—in keeping with the sanctioned privilege extended to all governors—it is my honor to address the people of this commonwealth, and to express to my fellow citizens the profound gratitude and deep sense of purpose that I feel in fulfilling your expectations.

Candor and honesty would have me admit to you that I was not blessed with the foresight to know that this moment was in the offing when I stood here in 1985. Having been tested in the political crucible of trial and cross-examination, I have been rendered a verdict by having had delivered unto me the greatest outpouring of votes ever accorded any candidate for this great office. For that, I shall be eternally grateful. And—be assured—I shall demonstrate that gratitude during the next four years by being a governor who will be beholden to but one special interest: the welfare of Virginians, all Virginians.

But my gratitude is not of such recent origin. It is said, "To whom much is given, much shall be expected." I will be the first to admit that I have been the beneficiary of much through no endeavors of my own. While I have indeed worked hard and performed to the best of my abilities, I have also had a few breaks along the way.

Indeed, in every walk—in every period of my life—there have been many more deserving and justly entitled to the fruits that wholesome opportunities present. And yet, for many, those chances never came and the bell of fulfillment never tolled for them. Providence indeed has directed my course. And I shall remain ever mindful of my good fortune.

In recent years, Virginia too has been blessed with good fortune. The progress and the prosperity we have enjoyed during this period has enabled us to reclaim the respected achievements of times past. In looking to our accomplishments in education, economic development, the environment, employment, housing, or transportation, we find that Virginia ranks among those states in the vanguard of forward-looking movement.

Not surprisingly, the ensuing pride in seeing our state climb in rank among our sister states in the nation and in preeminence among the Southern states, causes Virginians everywhere to feel good about our cause, our mission, and our success in forging Virginia's New Mainstream.

The commitment to looking ahead and not behind—of building rather than destroying; of bringing people together rather than pitting them against each other—also calls for me to address you with measured sobriety in facing conditions in the commonwealth today, and I will comment further in that regard when I address the General Assembly on Monday.

But for this moment, let me assure you that I do not intend to participate in bringing to a halt the momentum to which people of Virginia have grown accustomed, supported and enjoyed. Cicero, in parting observation, noted that "A commonwealth is not any collection of human beings...but an assembly of people joined in agreement on justice and partnership for the common good, and a community where civility must reign and all must live peacefully together." And we know what happened to Cicero's Rome, which could not pass on the heritage of its past to the people of its future. But we have done so; we can do so. And we shall do so. . . .

At this time—and in the place where so many great names in American history have trod—we renew this celebration of freedom in the full and certain knowledge that with it comes great responsibility. Without question, much tighter economic times which loom in the days ahead will test to the fullest our ability to make hard decisions, to lead, and to govern. But progress will be possible. Opportunity can be expanded. Freedom can be increased.

Resources employed in the past for the finer things in life can be—and will have to be—deployed for the more serious of our needs. For we know that freedom is but a word for the man or woman who needs and cannot find a job. Freedom—as it has been written—is a dream deferred when it "dries up like a raisin in the sun, and stinks like rotten meat."

Freedom is meaningless when a woman's right to choose is regulated outside the dictates of her own faith and conscience. Freedom is impotent when there is intolerance to those who hold moral and political beliefs different from our own. Freedom is restricted when labor and management cannot reach agreements. Freedom is impossible for the uneducated who try to live in today's complex world. Freedom is restrained for business and industry

when our network of transportation is allowed to deteriorate. Freedom for the police is denied when their resources are unduly limited. Freedom for the people is assaulted when lawful authority is abused. Freedom for the next generation is mortgaged when we destroy our environment. And—as has been proven throughout recorded history—freedom is nowhere to be found when the people are overtaxed and over-regulated.

As we salute the idea of freedom today, let us pledge to extend that same freedom to others tomorrow. Let us fulfill the perfect promise of freedom and liberty left as a legacy for us by those who founded this commonwealth. And let us likewise be thankful that—while our country gave birth to a freedom long denied and delayed for all who loved freedom—the belief in these dreams held by those forebears was passed from generation to generation, and spawned the seeds that propagated the will and the desire to achieve.

We are on hallowed ground today, and the steps we take from this place must be steps of honor. The words we issue must be words of wisdom. The laws we pass must be laws of mercy and justice. And the faith we possess must be true to the Almighty. In meeting these challenges—and they will be difficult—I ask your help and that of God.

I do not shrink from the enormity of the task. In six million Virginians, there is endless courage and enormous strength—in the coming years, we will need it all. As we all know, as complexities of human relationships increase, the power to govern them also increases. The proper use of that power must always be subordinated to the public good, and that shall be uppermost in the hearts and minds of those to whom those powers are justly delegated by the people.

We shall not pause; we shall not rest upon laurels. For we have not fulfilled our destinies. In the coming years, we must persist and make every citizen of our commonwealth the subject of our interest and concern. We must insist that every agency of our government utilize every proper and effective instrument to carry out the will of the people—for, as with any democracy, the will of the people is supreme.

An administration can only be effective when it works for the people, all of the people. Our prosperity can continue only if our leaders and private citizens alike stay constantly advised of all of the relevant facts. In turn, we can expect to receive your support—as well as your constructive criticism—when you receive true information from those of us who serve as your trustees.

I am undaunted by that which lies ahead, as we have shown at other points in our history what we can accomplish when we fearlessly face the future. We have—and we shall—shun the defects of destruction, and shall work to achieve the highest degree of improvement in our status of which we are capable. We have a common concern, and we share the responsibility.

I see a Virginia of hope and happiness, of mothers and fathers building and nurturing families in those hearthstones where the cradle of childhood is rocked with wholesome expectation for the future—a future in which an education is within intellectual and financial reach; a future in which adequate and affordable housing is possible; a future in which nothing is impossible. I see a place where crime is not only reduced and our streets and neighborhoods are safe, but the root causes thereof—illiteracy, poverty, joblessness—are stamped out. I see a Virginia where the homeless can find shelter, where hunger cannot and does not stalk those unable to fend for themselves.

We must set priorities in the coming years. Specifically, we must be partners in working toward a revived economy—a healthy and thriving economy that provides equal opportunity for all Virginians. While the flow may have slowed, Virginia's New Mainstream is far from drying up. It shall be the task of this administration to ensure that a rising tide of prosperity and opportunity is possible in the future.

Some describe conditions in our commonwealth today in dismal terms. And yet, one must question the resolve and the reserve of those who are not called upon to make sacrifices greater than those who have preceded us. Despite our economic slowdown, we are living in the best of times. And they can be even better. And they will be better.

If you will forgive me a moment of nostalgia, we mark today not a victory of party or the accomplishments of an individual, but the triumph of an idea—an idea as old as America, as old as the God who looks out for us all. It is the idea expressed so eloquently from this great commonwealth by those who gave shape to the greatest nation ever known: Jefferson, Madison, Mason, and their able colleagues.

The idea that all men and women are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights: the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The idea that shows forth in the concepts of freedom and opportunity—not only in Virginia, but more recently in the fresh, new winds of Eastern Europe and the tumult of Panama.

If these words about freedom are to be heard at all today, I hope they will be heard by the young people of this Commonwealth. I want them to know that oppression can be lifted; that discrimination can be eliminated; that poverty need not be binding; that disability can be overcome; and that the offer of opportunity in a free society carries with it the requirement of hard work, the rejection of drugs and other false highs, and a willingness to work with others whatever their color or national origin.

We have come far, but we have far to go. We have done much, but we have much to do. I ask for your energy, for your understanding, for your dedication, for your patience and, yes, for your prayers.

Four years ago, I said to the people of Virginia that I was proud to be a Virginian. I did not think then that my pride could possibly be greater. And, in theory, it isn't. But in reality, that pride does burst forth, and lifts my voice and my spirit to proclaim, "I am a son of Virginia."

I thank you all. And may God be ever with us. ■

February 1990

JCPS

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Inside This Issue:

- **Congressional leaders introduce legislation to restore judicial protections from employment discrimination that were struck down by the Supreme Court**
- **Federal Communication Commission policies which foster minority ownership of broadcast stations will be reviewed by the Supreme Court**
- **Wisconsin Governor Thompson seeks to set up a two-tier welfare system whereby recipients arriving from other states may not receive the Wisconsin rate for welfare until after living there for six months**
- **Across the Nation looks at a mayoral election in Oakland, California, and congressional contests in New Mexico and North Carolina**

A Rights Bill to Overturn High Court Rulings

On February 7, The Civil Rights Act of 1990 (CRA 1990) was introduced in both houses of Congress. The measure is primarily aimed at reversing last June's Supreme Court rulings that seriously limited the protections available to victims of employment discrimination under civil rights laws (see July 1989 *Focus*, "The Reagan Court: Turning Back the Clock"). The chief sponsors of the two identical versions of the bill, H.R. 4000 and S.2104, are Rep. **AUGUSTUS HAWKINS** (D-Calif.) and Sen. **EDWARD KENNEDY** (D-Mass.). They chair the congressional committees responsible for legislation involving discrimination in the workplace. Launched with strong bipartisan support, the legislation presently has 122 cosponsors in the House and 38 in the Senate as well as the backing of major civil rights groups.

"This legislation is necessary to prevent a retreat from the goal of equal justice and equal opportunity for all our people," says Hawkins. "For more than a quarter century, Congress, the courts, and a consensus of the American people have marched together toward that goal. Last year, the nation's highest court broke ranks with that democratic ideal and broke faith with that national commitment."

The main provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1990 follow.

Discrimination and Racial Harassment on the Job

In *Patterson v. McLean Credit Union*, the Supreme Court upheld the principle that a statute enacted in 1866, known as Section 1981, bans intentional race discrimination in the making of contracts. The Court ruled, however, that Section 1981 does not apply to the terms and conditions of the contract while the employee is on the job. As a result, an employee who had been insulted, harassed, or assigned demeaning work because of his or her race is left with no redress in the courts. The CRA 1990 would counter this by amending the original statute to reaffirm the rights of employees to enjoy all benefits, privileges, terms, and conditions established in employment contracts.

Burden of Proof to Shift Back Onto Employer

In *Wards Cove Packing Co. v. Atonio*, the Supreme Court overruled an 18-year precedent set in its unanimous *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.* decision. *Griggs* ruled that under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the burden of proof was on employers—rather than affected workers—to prove that employment practices which have the effect of disproportionately excluding minorities or women in hiring or promotions were required by business necessity. The Court's *Ward Cove* ruling shifted the burden of proof onto employees, saddling victims of discrimination with the difficult and expensive task of proving that their employer's practices are unjustified. The Civil Rights Act of 1990 would restore the *Griggs* rule.

Limits on After-the-Fact Challenges to Court Orders

In *Martin v. Wilks*, the Court allowed white fire-fighters to challenge a Birmingham, Alabama, consent decree which had established an affirmative action plan for municipal workers, even though the fire-fighters had not challenged the plan while it was being litigated. The CRA 1990 would strictly limit separate, after-the-fact challenges

while ensuring that anyone who might be adversely affected by a proposed court order would be notified immediately and would have an opportunity to challenge it.

Other provisions of the CRA 1990 would reinforce the principle that employment discrimination under any circumstances is illegal, and amend Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to afford women as well as religious and ethnic minorities the same rights as racial minorities to recover money damages for harassment on the job. The bill would specifically leave affirmative action laws and regulations unchanged, however, and would not address the issue of racial quotas.

The proposed legislation is on a fast track in both bodies of Congress, with House and Senate hearings scheduled to begin this month. Meanwhile, a struggle over the bill is developing between Congress and the White House. The Bush administration, which initially argued that no corrective action was warranted by the Court's June rulings, has been prompted by the Hawkins-Kennedy initiative to put forward its own bill drafted by the Justice Department. The administration bill deals with the *Patterson* case and with the High Court's *Lorance v. AT&T Technologies* decision, which limits the time frame in which discrimination charges may be brought against a seniority system. Testifying before Rep. Augustus Hawkins' Education and Labor Committee on Capitol Hill in February, Deputy Attorney General DONALD AYER asserted that the administration's bill is adequate because *Wards Cove, Martin v. Wilks,* and other Supreme Court decisions of last June should remain intact.

Reaction from the civil rights community was sharp and immediate. BENJAMIN HOOKS, head of the NAACP and chair of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (LCCR), rejected the administration's bill as a half measure. LCCR, a broad, national coalition of organizations, last year led the effort to block the administration's nomination of **WILLIAM LUCAS** as assistant attorney general for civil rights. It strongly supports the Hawkins-Kennedy bill and is certain to resist any attempts to dilute or delay the measure.

High Court to Review FCC's Minority Programs

After the Supreme Court ruled last year in *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.* to sharply narrow the allowable justifications for local and state minority business set-aside programs, many observers predicted it would soon begin overturning federal minority business programs as well. They may turn out to have been right. Last month the Court agreed to review two cases during this session—*Metro Broadcasting Inc. v. Federal Communications Commission* (FCC) and *Astroline Communications Company v. Shurberg Broadcasting*—in which two of the FCC's three policies on minority licensing and ownership of broadcast stations have been called into question. Observers are waiting to see if the Supreme Court will agree with an appeals court panel which last year ruled one of the FCC policies unconstitutional on the basis of *Croson.*

The FCC's comparative licensing policy, established in 1973 in response to an appeals court mandate, considers the minority make-up of applicant firms as one of several factors during hearings to award licenses for new television and radio channels. A second policy, known as the distress sale policy and established in 1978, applies only to the sale of existing stations threatened with losing their licenses. Under this policy, stations are allowed to sell their facilities at 75 percent of market value if the purchaser is a minority firm.

The comparative licensing policy was upheld last year by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, but will be reviewed by the Supreme Court in the *Metro* case. A different panel of the same appeals court, however, last year ruled against the distress sale policy, a decision that will be reviewed in the *Astroline* appeal. As yet unchallenged is a third FCC policy, also begun in 1978, which grants favorable tax status to the sale of any station to a minority buyer. All three policies were established after the courts and Congress found that the sale and transfer of broadcast stations were being tightly controlled by an old-boy network of white male executives.

The *Metro* case has grown out of the appeals court decision that the FCC was justified in denying Metro Broadcasting Inc. a license to operate a new UHF television station in Orlando, Florida. The FCC awarded the license instead to Rainbow Broadcasting, a firm which it found to be Metro's equal in background and experience but superior in its minority representation. Rainbow is owned by three Hispanics, two of them women, while all but one of Metro's nine male owners are white. Because the minority make-up of license applicants is only one of several criteria the FCC considers when reviewing requests for station licenses, the appellate panel concluded that the review policy is consistent with the flexible approach to affirmative action upheld by the Supreme Court's 1980 *Fullilove v. Klutznick* ruling. Unlike the Richmond set-aside program that was struck down by *Croson,* the federal set-aside program upheld by *Fullilove* did not use fixed numerical remedies.

However, in an apparently contradictory ruling by the same D.C. appeals court, a different judicial panel ruled that *Croson* does disqualify the FCC's distress sale policy as unconstitutional. The distress sale case arose when **ALAN SHURBERG,** who is white, challenged the FCC's rejection in 1984 of his request for a license to run WHCT-TV, a station in Hartford, Connecticut. The station's then-owner, Faith Center, was faced with having its li-

cense revoked by the FCC. Faith Center was allowed to make a special distress sale to minority-owned Astroline Communications Company, whose general partner, **RICHARD P. RAMIREZ,** is Hispanic. The appeals court ruled in favor of Shurberg, concluding that the FCC's distress sale policy was "not narrowly tailored to remedy past discrimination or to promote programming diversity," an echo of the *Croson* ruling.

Congress has always supported the FCC minority policies, voting in the last three years' appropriations bills to bar the FCC from changing the policies which in 1986 it announced it would consider doing. The Bush administration at first supported keeping the policies, joining the FCC in a court brief last autumn that defended their use. But on February 9, 1990, the Justice Department, acting independently from the FCC, made clear it was returning to the Reagan White House's position, urging the Supreme Court to overturn the minority licensing policy. The administration is expected to issue a follow-up brief urging that the distress sale policy be overturned as well. "The Justice Department did a flip-flop on the FCC's policies," says JAMES WINSTON, executive director of the National Association of Black Owned Broadcasters, "which shows that this is not about law but about politics. The Justice Department's last brief leaves the impression that President Bush's promise of a 'kinder, gentler nation' is not being born out in his concern for minorities."

However the Supreme Court decides these cases, minority ownership in broadcast stations remains very low, accounting for fewer than 300 (2.6 percent) of the 11,500 commercial radio and television outlets now in operation. Out of roughly 9,000 licenses issued since 1978, only 38 have come into minority hands through distress sales. By contrast, the FCC's minority licensing and tax policies, which still stand, are often cited as responsible for much of the growth in minority ownership, including the dramatic increases that took place between 1976 and 1981. According to Winston, the number of black-owned radio stations grew nearly five-fold during those five years alone, from 30 to 141. Although the FCC's tax policy is not now being challenged, a negative ruling by the Supreme Court could lead to its dissolution as well. Few people would argue that the old-boy club of white male media executives has afforded many opportunities to minorities over the last two decades. In Senate testimony on the issue last September, Winston observed that without the FCC's tax policy, "minority purchasers might as well disconnect their telephones, because they will never get another call to purchase a station."

Wisconsin Tries for Two-Tier Welfare

Wisconsin's Republican Governor TOMMY THOMPSON is seeking to establish an unprecedented two-tier welfare system that would no longer pay recipients who have relocated from other states the Wisconsin welfare rate on their arrival. Until they have remained in Wisconsin for six months, these "welfare migrants" would receive Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) payments at their home state's rate. No other state has attempted such a measure before now.

In 1986, Governor Thompson won election by focusing much of his campaign platform on the migrant welfare issue. The governor's critics charge that his plan is primarily aimed at keeping out welfare recipients from Illinois, which borders Wisconsin and pays AFDC families about $150 less per month than Wisconsin.

Thompson proposes to start the two-tier system as an experiment in three or four Wisconsin counties bordering Illinois. If it proves successful there, he would seek to establish it statewide. In order to move forward with the plan, he must first secure a waiver from U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) regulations. Then he would have to convince the Wisconsin legislature to pass enabling legislation. So far, the governor's lobbying of HHS to gain the Department's waiver has proved fruitless. Thompson has enlisted the support of an unlikely ally in **JOSEPH STROHL,** a Democrat and the majority leader in the state senate who has promised to back legislation establishing a two-tier system. Some local observers see Strohl's involvement as a way of positioning himself for an election challenge against Republican U.S. Senator **ROBERT KASTEN** in 1992.

Thompson has turned Wisconsin into what some are calling a "welfare battleground." In 1987, he cut the state's AFDC budget by six percent, and for the last three years he has slapped a freeze on any funding increases for the program. He has also instituted a controversial "Learnfare" program, in which a family's AFDC payments are entirely cut off if a child from the family fails to attend school. About 2,200 families are sanctioned each month under Learnfare, more than three-fourths of them in Milwaukee. As for the two-tier plan, "it means malicious welfare bashing" says black state Senator GARY GEORGE, cochair of the Wisconsin legislature's powerful Joint Finance Committee. "The plan is racially motivated because it's designed to discourage blacks from moving into the state from Illinois," says George. His district encompasses the predominantly black northern section of Milwaukee which contains a large percentage of welfare recipients. George is in a strong position to block any two-tier welfare bill because such a measure would go before his committee. The senator is not alone in opposing the Thompson plan. A coalition of church groups, social advocacy organizations, the state legal services program, and the Milwaukee public school system all oppose it and have threatened court action if it is enacted.

Across the Nation

CALIFORNIA: After serving three terms as mayor of Oakland, LIONEL WILSON, 74, will face serious opposition in his 1990 bid for reelection. Five black challengers—all Democrats—have entered this year's mayoral race to unseat the city's first black chief executive. During his 13-year tenure, Wilson's only significant competition up to now had come from city council member WILSON RILES JR. who challenged him in 1985. Riles is running again this year, along with state assemblyman ELIHU HARRIS, city council member LEO BAZILE, college administrator DEZIE WOODS-JONES, and 1968 Olympic track gold medalist JIM HINES.

Local analysts view the contest as a three-way race among the mayor, Riles, and Harris. Mayor Wilson may gain from the prestige and name recognition that go with being mayor for 13 years. He is credited with having opened up City Hall to the people of Oakland after it had been dominated for years by a white power structure (47 percent of the city is black). But Wilson's three-term incumbency could prove to be a double-edged sword. Some of his former supporters, including Elihu Harris, feel Wilson has been in office too long and say it's time for a change. The mayor's advancing age—he will be 75 by the primary—may also be a factor among some voters.

Wilson Riles, often thought of as the conscience of the city council, is an advocate of affordable housing and protecting residential neighborhoods against downtown development. He also fought to have the city designated a Nuclear Free Zone. Riles has been on the council for 10 years; he garnered 31 percent of the vote in the last mayoral election, and he has built up strong name recognition.

Not as visible as either Riles or Mayor Wilson is Elihu Harris, an attorney who has served 12 years in the California Assembly. Although Harris's district takes in about 70 percent of Oakland, critics charge he has not been able to use his Judiciary Committee chairmanship to respond to his constituents' bread and butter issues. The committee has been a powerful tool for raising money, however, as Harris has raised more than the mayor and Riles combined—much of it from California's legal community.

Whoever emerges as the victor, the next mayor will have to deal with the city's continuing recovery from last year's devastating earthquake and with corruption in the city's school system. Residents of the poor black neighborhood bisected by the Route 880 bridge which collapsed during the quake are demanding that the bridge be rebuilt elsewhere. And the public school system has been scandalized by the recent arrests of 13 of the system's employees for fraud, nepotism, payroll padding, embezzlement, and theft.

NEW MEXICO: Black Democratic state treasurer JAMES LEWIS is seeking to challenge incumbent Republican STEVEN H. SCHIFF for his 1st Congressional District seat. A former treasurer of Bernalillo County (which includes Albuquerque) and university administrator, Lewis will have his work cut out for him if he is to win a seat in Congress. First, Lewis will have to defeat Secretary of State REBECCA VIGIL-GIRON, who is Hispanic, in the June 5 Democratic primary. This may not be easy since the district is nearly 40 percent Hispanic and only about two percent black.

Even if Lewis wins the primary, defeating Schiff in the general election will be difficult in a district that has voted Republican in the last four presidential elections and that returned former Republican Congressman **MANUEL LUJAN** (now Secretary of the Interior) to office for 20 years. Schiff's high profile as a law-and-order district attorney aided him in his 1988 race. In that race, he narrowly beat well-funded Democratic attorney **TOM UDALL**, the nephew of Rep. **MORRIS UDALL** (D-Ariz.), winning 51 percent of the vote.

Lewis believes Schiff can be beaten this year because he's a first-termer who was elected by a slim margin. Furthermore, although the state is only two percent black, Lewis has built broad coalitions. He has hooked into a network of political contacts through his membership in numerous clubs and associations, ranging from the American G.I. Forum (a mainly Hispanic organization) to the Temple Albert Men's Club (a Jewish group). As a Democrat, Lewis has been able to appeal to a broad spectrum of the electorate, including many Republicans. In fact, in his statewide election to treasurer in 1986, he even polled more votes than Republican Governor GARREY CARRUTHERS.

NORTH CAROLINA: Ever since the nasty and expensive 1984 Senate campaign, the Democratic Party has had a tough time finding candidates to challenge incumbent Republican Senator **JESSE HELMS**, whose term expires this year. In the 1984 race, Helms beat former Democratic Governor **JAMES HUNT** by 52 percent to 48 percent. **This year, Hunt has declined a rematch with the arch-conservative three-termer. So far, four Democrats have decided to enter the fray, including HARVEY GANTT, the former black mayor of Charlotte.**

Gantt became Charlotte's first black mayor in 1983 and was reelected in 1985. In 1987 he lost to white Republican SUE MYRICK, in a third-term bid. Before 1983, Gantt had served as a city councilman and mayor pro tem. After leaving office, he returned to Gantt Huberman Architects, a firm he cofounded in 1971.

Although no black politician has ever been elected statewide in North Carolina, Gantt's chances to win the Democratic senatorial nomination are strong. Blacks constitute 31 percent of the state's registered Democrats, and Gantt has already proven his cross-racial voter appeal (Charlotte is only 25 percent black). Given what promises to be a crowded primary field, Gantt may benefit from North Carolina's newly revised primary election law which only requires that a candidate win a 40 percent plurality to become the nominee (instead of 50 percent-plus-one to avoid a run-off election). The law is pending at the Justice Department for preclearance in accordance with Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

In a general election, Gantt would be helped by a high turnout among North Carolina's 23 percent black population. Helms has an abysmal voting record on civil rights, South African sanctions, funding for social programs, and other issues of importance to black Americans. In an attempt to curry favor among black voters, the senator recently hired former civil rights activist **JAMES MEREDITH** as an aide on his staff (see October 1989 TrendLetter). But that is unlikely to blunt black opposition. In each of his three previous elections Helms received less than five percent of the black vote.

Moreover, Gantt could do well among North Carolina's white voters. With the end of the Reagan presidency and the waning of the conservative movement, Helms' espousal of right-wing issues may no longer have the edge it had when he ran with RONALD REAGAN on the ballot in '84. Gantt, on the other hand, intends to run on issues that hit closer to home—like education, health care, reproductive rights, day care, and the drug problem. Gantt says Helms is beatable because, in his view, he is out of step with the times. "Helms is more popular with right-wing dictators than he is with voters in North Carolina," says Gantt. The voters will let us know if he's right on election day.

Court Ruling Favors Minority Set-Asides

King County, Washington, Set-Aside Program for Minorities and Women, Revised to Meet the Supreme Court's Croson *Standards, Is Upheld*

by Pamela Joshi

On December 6, 1989, U.S. District Judge William L. Dwyer handed down a decision that upheld the constitutionality of the minority and women business set-aside program of King County, Washington (which encompasses the city of Seattle). The ruling in *Coral Construction* v. *King County* is believed to mark the first time a set-aside program has been upheld by a federal court after being revised to meet the standards set by last January's U.S Supreme Court decision in *City of Richmond* v. *J.A. Croson Co.*

In the *Croson* decision, the Supreme Court overturned a Richmond set-aside program that required at least 30 percent of the dollar amount of each prime city construction contract to be subcontracted out to minority firms (see *Focus,* January-February 1989). However, the Court did not declare set-asides as such unconstitutional.

The plaintiffs in the *King County* case were the white-owned Coral Construction Company, based in Portland, and the Oregon chapter of the Associated General Contractors. Last October, the plaintiffs challenged the King County set-aside program on the grounds that it violated Coral's Fourteenth Amendment equal protection rights. Coral Construction was the lowest bidder on a $180,000 county guardrail construction contract that was awarded to an Asian-owned company instead.

Judge Dwyer, citing *Croson,* upheld the King County set-aside program because it met the Supreme Court's strict scrutiny standards for state and local minority set-aside programs. King County ensures minority and female participation in county contracting through a flexible program tailored to meet the standards established by the Supreme Court in *Croson.*

The first standard that a state or local government must meet is providing evidence of past discrimination to justify a compelling state interest in applying a remedy. This may be accomplished by providing specific incidents or practices of discrimination, by demonstrating that the local government was a passive participant in a system which practices discrimination, or through statistical evidence of underutilization of minority- and women-owned firms. (Some jurisdictions are commissioning statistical disparity studies to justify their set-asides.)

In the *King County* case, the District Court was provided evidence that contractors refused to hire minority- and women-owned businesses even when they had made the lowest bids on contracts. These businesses were also required to meet more stringent subcontracting terms than white-owned firms. Furthermore, King County was found to have been a passive participant in discrimination because it commissioned contracts from companies that practiced racial and gender discrimination.

Under the second standard set by the Supreme Court, a jurisdiction must have carefully considered race-neutral alternatives before implementing minority set-asides. King County officials had investigated other remedies, such as reducing bonding requirements and offering direct financial assistance. These could not be used because they are illegal under Washington state law.

The third standard requires minority set-aside programs to be narrowly tailored to address the identified discrimination. King County's program satisfied that standard because it was specifically based on the number of available minority firms in the relevant market.

In *King County,* the district court also had to rule on the women-owned business program, an issue not addressed by *Croson.* Historically, women-owned businesses have been subject to a much less stringent standard of review than that applied in *Croson.* In *King County,* the district court felt the women's set-aside program was based on enough evidence of past discrimination to be held constitutional.

Although the ruling in *King County* is seen as a glimmer of hope in the civil rights community, its value as a precedent is being viewed with caution. Tyrone Press, chief of investigations and research at the Minority Business Enterprise Legal Defense and Education Fund, views the decision as encouraging, but he cites two reasons why it does not establish a set-aside model that could be used by other jurisdictions. First, the case was appealed on December 28, 1989, to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and has yet to be ruled on. Second, a fact-finding disparity study, commissioned by King County to document discrimination in accordance with *Croson,* was not considered in the decision.

Despite the positive ruling in *King County,* the *Croson* ruling continues to be used to strike down set-aside programs. So far, at least eight set-aside programs have been deemed unconstitutional, approximately 33 are under court challenge, and about 20 state and local jurisdictions have voluntarily suspended their programs. Nevertheless, advocates of these programs hope *King County* will be the first of many decisions that will uphold the principle of group-sensitive remedies for past discrimination, thus vindicating the set-aside concept. ■

Ms. Joshi is a research assistant at the Joint Center.

Is a New Yardstick Needed to Measure Poverty?

Revisions in the Method of Measuring Poverty Could Mean a Big Change in the Number of Americans Considered Poor, Affecting Eligibility for Social Programs

by Joyce E. Allen and Margaret C. Simms

After two decades of anti-poverty programs, the number of poor people in America has grown, according to official federal government statistics. In 1969, the number living below the poverty line was just over 24 million (12.1 percent of the population), while in 1988 it was 31.9 million (13.1 percent). Although the proportion of black Americans in poverty (33 percent) remained constant, their number climbed from 7.1 to 9.4 million during that period. A debate has been going on in the nation's capitol over whether the increase in the number of poor Americans reflects the apparent intractability of poverty or whether the trend has resulted simply from the way poverty is measured.

Measuring poverty is important because eligibility for many federal programs (including the Food Stamp Program, the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, and child nutrition programs) is based in part on the official poverty level. A change in how poverty is measured could affect the amount of money Congress budgets for programs essential to the economic well-being of millions of Americans. The debate has taken on greater significance because the Bush administration wants to increase funding next year for federal studies to improve the quality of economic statistics. One of these studies would seek to develop new poverty income guidelines.

Origin of the Poverty Thresholds

The present definition of poverty is often considered to be obsolete because it is based on living standards and conditions that existed more than 20 years ago. In the mid-1960s, while the War on Poverty was being declared, Mollie Orshansky, an official at the Social Security Administration, developed a method for measuring poverty and for estimating the number of people in poverty. Orshansky's concept was based on the cost of a minimally adequate diet, one that would sustain an individual or family for a limited period of time.

The cost of this "economy" diet or food budget was estimated and then combined with information from a 1955 survey of consumption expenditures of American households. Since the survey indicated that the typical family spent one-third of its annual budget on food, the economy food plan was multiplied by three to determine the poverty thresholds, that is, the money income limits to be used in identifying families or individuals who were poor. The economy food budget varied depending on household size and composition (age and sex of members).

With slight modifications, the Orshansky thresholds were adopted in 1969 by the Bureau of the Budget (now the Office of Management and Budget) as the official measure of poverty. Except for annual updates to adjust for inflation as measured by the consumer price index and for minor technical adjustments in 1981, the Orshansky method has remained unchanged since it was adopted.

This method of measuring poverty has always generated controversy because it has several shortcomings. For example, it is based on a food budget designed for emergency food needs. Further, the consumption survey it relies on excludes homeless families and individuals, almost all of whom are likely to be poor.

The controversy over how poverty should be measured has heated up with the release of two reports last October. In one report, *Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States: 1988*, the U.S. Bureau of the Census published alternative estimates of the number of Americans in poverty. This marked the first time that alternative estimates have been included in this annual report. The alternative estimates, which are based on the dollar value of noncash benefits and a revised price index, show fewer people in poverty than the official estimate.

The second report, *Alternative Measures of Poverty*, which was prepared for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress (JEC), indicates that the poverty population may have increased more dramatically in the past 20 years than the official numbers show. Unlike the Census Bureau report, the JEC report takes into account changes in consumption patterns for housing and child care. Using their updated poverty thresholds, which were based on new data on family consumption patterns, the authors of the JEC report estimate that the poverty rate was 24.1 percent in 1987, as opposed to the official rate of 13.5 percent.

Dr. Allen is a senior research associate and Dr. Simms is a deputy director of research at the Joint Center.

Given these two reports, resolving contradictions in the way we measure poverty has become an immediate public policy concern. While most of the attention has focused on noncash benefits, other major weaknesses in the current method may need to be examined. In particular, changes that have taken place in the cost of living and in living standards since the official definition of poverty was adopted two decades ago may need to be reconsidered.

Counting Noncash Benefits

The official measurement of poverty is based on cash income only, an approach that may have been more credible before the noncash (in-kind) public assistance programs of the 1960s were established. Since the War on Poverty was launched, the poor have received more and more public assistance in the form of noncash benefits, such as food stamps and Medicaid. The value of this assistance is not included in measuring a family's income.

In fiscal year 1969, approximately 52 percent of all federal public assistance was in cash and the remainder was in goods and services such as food, medical care, and housing. By fiscal year 1988, because of tremendous growth in Medicaid and the Food Stamp Program, cash accounted for only 29 percent of federal public assistance benefits while goods and services made up the remaining 71 percent.

Since in-kind benefits are an important part of the "safety net" that exists for the poor, it has often been suggested that these benefits be included when calculating whether or not a person is poor. Clearly, fewer people would be considered in poverty if the value of their in-kind benefits were taken into account. The Census Bureau estimates that the poverty rate would have been 2.6 percentage points lower in 1988 (10.5 instead of 13.1 percent) if certain in-kind benefits including Medicaid coverage, food stamps, free and reduced-price school lunches, and rent subsidies were counted (see table).

However, blacks are differentially affected if those in-kind benefits are counted as income. For example, their poverty rate would have been 6.8 percentage points lower in 1988 (24.8 instead of 31.6 percent) due to their relatively heavy reliance on noncash benefits as compared to the general population. Similarly, the poverty rate for black children would have been nine percentage points lower as compared to 2.9 percentage points lower for white children.

A number of unresolved issues surround the valuation of in-kind benefits. Among them are deciding which in-kind benefits should be included in the definition of income and finding the most appropriate methodology for placing a dollar value on them. Two techniques for valuing in-kind benefits used by the Census Bureau are the market-value approach and the recipient-value approach. These alternative techniques yield different poverty rates.

The market-value approach tends to result in the largest reduction in rates of poverty. Market value is based on the private sector (or market) price of the goods and services received. The recipient-value approach, by contrast, is based on the program participant's own valuation of the benefit. Theoretically, this second approach reflects recipients' subjective valuation of the amount of cash they would be willing to accept in place of their in-kind benefits.

Differences Between Official and Alternative Estimates of Poverty, 1988
(Impact of Including Noncash Benefits in Income)

	Poverty Rates		
Persons	Official[1]	Alternative[2]	Percentage Point Decline
All	13.1%	10.5%	2.6
White	10.1	8.3	1.8
Black	31.6	24.8	6.8
Hispanic	26.8	22.0	4.8
Related Children Under 18			
All	19.6	15.5	4.1
White	14.4	11.5	2.9
Black	44.1	35.1	9.0
Hispanic	37.8	30.5	7.3

[1] Official estimates are based on cash income only.
[2] Alternative estimates are based on cash income plus the value of noncash benefits such as food stamps, school lunches, rent subsidies and Medicare coverage. The value of noncash benefits was estimated based on the market value approach, except for medical services.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1989.

The valuation of medical benefits poses special problems. For example, under one method of valuing medical benefits, the more medical services a Medicaid recipient receives, the richer he or she would appear to be, because that person's estimated income would include the value of medical services received by beneficiaries and paid for by the government. Given the difficulty of placing a cash value on medical benefits, some researchers suggest that they not be included as an in-kind benefit.

Changes in Minimum Living Standards

Living standards and price levels have changed significantly since the official way of measuring poverty was first adopted. After all, the consumption data used to produce Orshansky's "one-third food, two-thirds other goods and services" formula are now 35 years old. As income has increased for the average family over the years, and as the cost of other essentials has grown, the proportion of income that is spent on food has decreased.

Given this trend, some analysts, including Orshansky herself, have urged that the multiplier be adjusted over time to reflect changing consumption patterns. For example, some researchers contend that a proportion of "one-fifth food" is probably more plausible today, which suggests that a multiplier greater than three (perhaps as high as four or five) should be used to estimate the corre-

(Continued on back page)

Is a New Yardstick Needed?

(Continued from page 7)

sponding household budget. This would mean that the poverty thresholds would be significantly higher and that more people would be classified as being in poverty. Child care is another example of how consumption patterns have changed over time. Once only a small proportion of family budgets, it now constitutes an essential cost for many families. Yet this change is not reflected in the current poverty thresholds.

Since the poverty thresholds are updated annually to reflect price changes, an ongoing issue is how best to measure these changes. The Labor Department concluded in the early 1980s that the Consumer Price Index used in the 1970s to update the poverty thresholds gave too much weight to housing in estimating the cost of living for the average family. Thus, in 1983, the Bureau of Labor Statistics began to use an alternative method for estimating changes in the cost of living, one that uses the rental value of housing. However, the alternative method was not projected backward to the middle 1970s. If it had been, the alternative poverty rate would be lower than the official one. For example, the overall poverty rate for 1988 would be 11.6 percent, instead of 13.1 percent and the rate for blacks would be 29.1 percent rather than 31.6 percent. Some critics of the current way of measuring poverty argue that the alternative method, with its rental value, should have been projected backward and that the official measure of poverty should incorporate this change.

Revising the Poverty Line

Given the nation's continuing concern about poverty, it seems fairly clear that something should be done to change the poverty thresholds that are used to measure our progress over time. The question is, what should be done? To the extent that our attempts to measure poverty are based on a desire to identify those in need and to assist them, it may be appropriate to include some noncash benefits when measuring income. However, to the extent that we are also attempting to define a minimally adequate standard, it would also be necessary to revisit methods of estimating the cost and standard of living.

Clearly, if we include housing subsidies in the income side we need to adjust upward our thresholds for the changes in the proportion of income that must be spent on housing (estimated to be as high as 50 percent of income for some poor families). If we expect mothers to work, especially those at the low end of the income scale, we should include the cost of child care in the family budget. In any case, the "correction" that may be necessary requires more than just a quick fix. ■

Join Us at Our 20th Anniversary Dinner

The Joint Center for Political Studies will celebrate its 20th Anniversary at this year's annual dinner on Wednesday, April 4, 1990, to be held at the Washington Hilton Hotel here in the nation's capital. Virginia Governor L. Douglas Wilder will be honored at the event.

David T. Kearns, chairman and chief executive officer of Xerox Corporation, is the national dinner chairman, and Robert B. Washington, Jr., managing partner of the law firm of Laxalt, Washington, Perito & Dubuc, is chairing the General Dinner Committee.

Sponsors' tables of 10 seats each are priced at $5,000; patrons' tables of 10 are $2,500; and individual tickets are $250. For further information or to make reservations, please call Alfreda Edwards at 202—626-3555.

FOCUS
Joint Center for Political Studies®
1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3500

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify FOCUS of any change of address or title. YOU MUST ATTACH THE MAILING LABEL FROM THE BACK COVER when writing about service or change of address. No change can be made without this information. Allow 6 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 6958
Washington, D.C.

ADDRESS
CORRECTION
REQUESTED

Postmaster: Form 3547 requested

20063
SRI
Acquisitions Editor
Congressional Info Svc, Inc.
4520 East-West Hwy.
Bethesda, MD 20814

Volume 18, No. 3 March 1990

R585-4

20th Anniversary Issue

FOCUS

The monthly magazine of the Joint Center for Political Studies®

On to the Next 20 Years

The Joint Center Will Continue to be a Critical Policy Resource to Decision Makers Addressing The Next Century's Challenges

An Agenda for Healing: Congressional Initiatives for 1990

As External Threats to National Security Decrease, the Congressional Black Caucus Is Pushing to Redirect Our National Priorities Toward Human Development

Louis Martin, the Godfather

As Its First Chairman, Martin Guided the Joint Center Through Difficult Beginnings; As a Board Member, His Counsel Has Been Invaluable Over the Last 20 Years

A History of the Joint Center 1970–1990

For 20 Years, the Joint Center Has Led the Way, Through Its Policy Research, to Make American Political, Economic, and Social Institutions More Responsive to the Concerns of African-Americans

ISSN 0740-0195

PRICE $1.50

On to the Next 20 Years

The Joint Center Will Continue to be a Critical Policy Resource to Decision Makers Addressing The Next Century's Challenges

by Eddie N. Williams

Next month, the Joint Center celebrates its 20th anniversary. For us this is a dramatic and historic occasion, a time to reflect on beginnings and achievements and to express gratitude to individuals and enterprises that have made our work possible. It is also a time for rededication to our unique mission as a research and public policy institution: to contribute to the national interest by helping black Americans participate fully in the political and economic mainstreams of our society.

This issue of *Focus* includes a historical essay on the Joint Center's first 20 years by Dr. Darlene Clark Hine, the John A. Hannah Professor of History at Michigan State University. The essay has been adapted from her forthcoming book on the subject, to be published in the fall of 1990 by University Press of America.

While celebrating our past, we are also developing a strategic vision of the future. This vision is reflected in one important change we have made at this juncture. The Joint Center has undergone a slight name change. Our new name, Joint Center for Political *and Economic* Studies, conveys, with its two added words, a more accurate definition of who we are and what we do. The Joint Center's name change indicates our growing involvement in economic policy areas, in both national and international affairs. We believe that economic empowerment will be a major thrust of black aspirations well into the 21st century, and the Joint Center is committed to responding to these aspirations in the years ahead as it has to black political aspirations over the past 20 years.

The dramatic progress blacks have made since the end of World War II constitutes one of the major social revolutions in modern times. This fact is underscored—anecdotally and symbolically, to be sure—by blacks serving as justice on the U.S. Supreme Court, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, head of the Democratic Party, and chief executives of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the City of New York.

In the private sector, as well, blacks have broken old barriers to achievement. Media superstars now receive top billing alongside black athletes and, in a few cases, black coaches of major sports teams. In 1989 two black businessmen became the principal owners of a National Basketball Association franchise. Another owns an international business of the Fortune 500 variety, and more blacks are appearing at the apex of the corporate pyramid. Furthermore, the black middle class has grown substantially over the past two decades.

Research provides further evidence of improved well-being among blacks over the past five decades: in enhanced income and living standards; health and life expectancy; and educational, occupational, and residential opportunities. While different studies and analysts report different degrees of progress on these measures, there is virtually no serious disagreement about the basic direction of change.

FOCUS
Copyright © 1990 Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc.
The monthly magazine of the **Joint Center for Political Studies**, 1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 626-3500. The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national, nonprofit, tax-exempt institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs. Opinions expressed in signed *Focus* articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Joint Center for Political Studies. *Focus* is published monthly. $15.00 per year by JCPS, Inc.

PRESIDENT/Eddie N. Williams
VICE PRESIDENT/Eleanor Farrar
DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/Kathleen Vander Horst
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION/Brenda Watkins Noel
DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES/Auriel Pilgrim
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH/Milton Morris
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE/Russell Owens
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS/Nancy Stella

ASSOC. DIR. OF COMMUNICATIONS, ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS/Mark Lloyd
EDITOR, *Focus*/David C. Ruffin
SENIOR EDITOR/Marc DeFrancis
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR/Cheryl Miller
ASSOCIATE EDITOR/Constance B. Toliver
TRENDLETTER RESEARCHER/Alfred Baltimore
WORD PROCESSOR/Merlinda Caniza Novicio

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wendell Freeland/Attorney at Law, *Chairman*
Andrew F. Brimmer/Brimmer and Company, Inc., *Vice Chairman*
Louis E. Martin/Calmar Communications, *Treasurer*
Eddie N. Williams/Joint Center for Political Studies, *President*
Bishop John Hurst Adams/Senior Bishop, A.M.E. Church
Robert McCormick Adams/Smithsonian Institution
Norma Asnes/Writer
Hannah D. Atkins/Secretary of State, Oklahoma
Lucius J. Barker/Washington University
George L. Brown/Grumman Corporation
Charles U. Daly/John F. Kennedy Library and Museum
Marian Wright Edelman/Children's Defense Fund
Luther Hilton Foster/Alexandria, Virginia
Charles V. Hamilton/Columbia University
Ira C. Herbert/Coca-Cola USA
Elsie H. Hillman/Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Bertram M. Lee, Sr./BML Associates, Inc.
Bernard Rapoport/American Income Life Insurance Co.
Sharon Percy Rockefeller/WETA-TV/FM

Members Emeriti: William B. Boyd, Robert C. Maynard, James D. Wolfensohn

Eleanor Farrar/JCPS, *Secretary to the Board*

While progress may have been slow in coming and may still elude more than a third of all blacks, it nevertheless is tangible evidence of what is desirable and achievable and it establishes a framework for initiatives by blacks, whites, and governments at all levels in the future. One clear goal of the Joint Center's research and policy analyses for the '90s is to give impetus and support to the continuing process of positive change.

Building on past achievements will contribute significantly to future progress. So, too, will documentation and articulation of continuing problems, such as the current resurgence in overt racism, and of the political and public policy implications of those problems.

The resurgence of incidents of manifest racism coincides with social conditions that underscore the deep, longstanding consequences of a history of racial inequality. The still widening gap between blacks and whites in educational achievement, the rapidly growing population of urban blacks mired in poverty, the scourges of drugs and lifestyle-related diseases that ravage large segments of the black population, and the continued deterioration of family and other institutions, all fuel a sense of gloom and permanent handicap.

The changes we have all witnessed in race relations, both progress and retrogression, illustrate the complexity of the problems of race, the difficulty of identifying lasting solutions, and the need to keep searching for workable answers.

Looking toward the year 2000, the Joint Center's research and information programs will play a critical role as blacks and the nation confront a future in which racial differences will continue both to influence the public policy agenda and to create tensions that demand special attention. Consider these projections:

- Blacks will constitute a growing proportion of the labor pool, and many of them will be poorly prepared to compete in a complex global economy.
- Without greater private sector involvement and more vigorous government action, the overall economic condition of blacks will continue to lag behind that of whites.
- The black community faces increasing polarization into two disparate and growing groups: a middle class and a poverty population characterized by teenage pregnancy, crime, drug abuse, poor educational opportunities, and joblessness.
- Public policy is becoming less race-specific at all levels of government.
- The black community will play an increasingly aggressive role in the search for solutions to the problems it faces.

For two decades now, through its research, its unique access to black leaders, and its consensus-building activities, the Joint Center has met the need for objective, critical thinking about public policies that affect race relations in America and about the political process by which these policies are developed and implemented. This need is becoming ever more urgent.

In the years ahead, the Joint Center will continue to strive both to elucidate the issues of race in America and to anticipate their direction as we address the pressing political and economic needs of black Americans and of the nation. We pledge our best efforts to meet the challenges before us as a center of intellectual discovery and a wellspring of practical political knowledge; as an organization of unquestioned credibility; and as a forum in which scholars and political leaders with diverse interests and views can exchange ideas, interact on public policy issues, and search for consensus. ■

The Joint Center Changes Its Name

The Joint Center for Political Studies, the nation's preeminent black think tank, has adopted a new name: Joint Center for Political *and Economic* Studies. The name change reflects the institution's growing involvement in the economic policy issues that determine the quality of life for all Americans.

Announcing the name change, the Joint Center's president Eddie N. Williams, said: "Our new name reflects the emergence of economic issues as the key challenges for blacks in the decade of the nineties and signals our intention to help meet those challenges.

"Twenty years ago, when the Joint Center was established, the main challenge before us was to secure the power of the vote for black Americans and to provide useful information and training for newly elected black officials. It was this need that the Joint Center was created to fill. Today, more and more, the focus of black aspirations is economic advancement. While continuing to respond to black political strivings, the Joint Center will now be more responsive to the economic imperatives that we must confront in this decade and the next century. Trade and tax policies, business productivity, and a better trained work force are among the issues that will shape our future and our nation's future and determine our place in the world.

JOINT CENTER
FOR
POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC STUDIES

"The expansion of the Joint Center's program to encompass domestic and international economic issues is an evolutionary process that has been well underway for several years now. Joint Center research, publications, and special projects have been dedicated to such issues as schooling for minority students, employment, and poverty. Thus, our new name makes official a change that we have been growing toward over time, as we grapple with the public policy issues and challenges of the day. However, our mission remains the same: to promote full participation for blacks in the political and economic life of our nation."

An Agenda for Healing: Congressional Initiatives for 1990

As External Threats to National Security Decrease, the Congressional Black Caucus Is Pushing to Redirect Our National Priorities Toward Human Development

by David C. Ruffin

Members of Congress are seizing on the opportunity presented by the recent advent of non-socialist governments in Eastern Europe and Central America. As the rationale fades for increased defense spending, policy makers are calling for reinvestment in solutions to long deferred problems like the growth in illiteracy and infant mortality and the declining skill levels of the labor force. Nevertheless, these proposals must survive-stiff opposition from congressional conservatives and the Bush administration who charge that the programs are too expensive. The following are some of the initiatives that the 101st Congress is considering in its second session.

Black Caucus Budget Alternative

In March, the Congressional Black Caucus introduced its "Quality of Life Budget" as an alternative federal budget proposal for fiscal year 1991. The Caucus challenges Congress and the Bush administration to reprogram tens of billions of dollars from armaments and reinvest them in the nation's human and physical resources. The CBC budget would reduce spending for military and space programs by $25.3 billion, raise $19.8 billion in additional revenues, and spend $46.5 billion more on social programs. The following figures show how the CBC budget differs from the administration's proposal for FY91 in major program areas (figures in billions):

Defense	-$23.711
General Science, Space and Technology	-1.409
Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	+4.201
Health	+3.845
Medicare	+5.538
Income Security (includes subsidized housing)	+5.262
Social Security	+.938
Drug Programs	+.992
Transportation	+1.210
International Affairs (including foreign aid)	+1.714
Natural Resources and Environment	+.660

Mr. Ruffin is the editor of *Focus* magazine.

In presenting its budget, the CBC condemns the continued neglect of those in need—the young, the physically disadvantaged, and the jobless. The black legislators call for a federal fiscal policy that reaffirms a national concern for social and economic justice.

Head Start Reauthorization

Head Start, the successful early child development program now observing its 25th anniversary, is due to expire this year. Democrats and Republicans agree that the program is effective and should be reauthorized for another four years, but disagree on how much the government ought to pay for it. On March 1, Rep. Dale Kildee (D-Mich.), chair of the Education and Labor Subcommittee on Human Resources, introduced H.R. 4150, his "full funding" proposal to authorize $2.7 billion for fiscal year 1991 ($1 billion more than in fiscal year 1990). Kildee's bill would fund Head Start for eligible three-, four-,and five-year-olds at an estimated cost of $3,500 per pupil.

The bill would expand the proportion of eligible children enrolled in Head Start from 18 percent (the official estimates of those now served) to 40 percent. The measure would also pay for program improvements and salary increases for teachers and staff. Overall, it would raise Head Start funding to $4.3 billion in fiscal year 1992, $5.9 billion in 1993, and $7.7 billion in 1994. A companion bill, S. 2229, has been introduced by Sen. Christopher Dodd (D-Conn.).

African and Caribbean Development

The Congressional Black Caucus plans to introduce the Mickey Leland African and Caribbean Development Act to double foreign aid to Africa and the Caribbean to nearly $1 billion. Funds for the expanded aid package would go toward economic development, long-term debt restructuring, and relief from the famine on the horn of Africa that threatens over five million people with starvation. The bill also earmarks $260 million for Caribbean development assistance. Caucus chair Ronald Dellums (D-Calif.) has warned that CBC members would vote against any omnibus foreign aid bill that did not include these provisions. ■

March 1990

POLITICAL TRENDLETTER®

Inside This Issue:

- **Selma remains divided over the firing of Norward Roussell, the city's first black school superintendent; meanwhile, Boston removes Laval Wilson as its first black top school executive**
- **Small town mayors receive training on how to be better municipal administrators**
- **Across the Nation looks at Coy Payne's mayoral victory in Arizona; Maxine Waters in Los Angeles and former Bush administration official J. Kenneth Blackwell in Cincinnati are running for Congress; and former congressman Charles Diggs is running for a state legislative post in Maryland**

Firing of Selma's Black School Chief Angers Community

Selma, Alabama, where voting rights marchers were brutally beaten by police on the Edmund Pettus Bridge 25 years ago on "Bloody Sunday," is in the throes of a new battle that is once again pitting the black and white communities against one another. The issue is the December firing of Dr. NORWARD ROUSSELL, the city's first black school superintendent, by the Selma School Board. The dismissal spurred black students to boycott classes and moved black parents to protest the actions of the school board and the city administration. All the black members of the school board have resigned in reaction to the dismissal. Whether Roussell stays or goes is now in the hands of the federal courts, since he has filed a $10 million law suit against the school board for violating his civil rights.

In a decision that broke exactly along racial lines, the white-majority school board (with six white members and five black members) voted last December 21 to dismiss Roussell and to not renew his contract. Roussell, whose current contract expires on June 30, was hired in 1987 and earns an annual salary of $80,000. The board's official reason for firing him was that he had a "dictatorial" style of management. But according to blacks who are protesting the dismissal, Roussell was fired because he ended a tracking system whereby talented black students were routinely excluded from advanced classes that seemed to be reserved for whites. "Ninety percent of the white students were in the higher tracks and 90 percent of the black students were in the lower tracks," say attorney J. L. chestnut, who represents the Best Educational Support Team, a parents' protest organization. In this new form of segregation, many black students have been kept out of college preparatory courses like algebra and biology. "They only want to train black kids to be carpenters and mechanics," Chestnut says.

The five black school board members resigned in protest immediately after the vote. Their opposition was echoed by the black community when a quarter of the school system's 6,000 students, most of whom are black, walked out of classes. Parents have been demonstrating day and night against the administration of white Mayor **JOE SMITHERMAN** in front of City Hall. Tension mounted in February as about 150 black students occupied Selma High School for five days. Mayor Smitherman (who was also mayor in 1965 at the time of Bloody Sunday) sought a court order to forcibly remove the students, but federal district judge **CHARLES BUTLER** denied the request. The denial precipitated a decision by education and city officials to close the entire 11-school system.

Roussell, who disagreed with the boycott, eventually convinced the students to leave the Selma High voluntarily. The city's chools reopened on February 13, surrounded by state troopers and 200 National Guardsmen who had

been ordered to the scene by Republican Gov. **GUY HUNT.** Relenting to community pressure, the school board reinstated Roussell, but only to finish out this contract year. While the black students have returned to their classes, more than 300 white students have been withdrawn from the public schools by parents who feared for their safety, and they now swell the area's white private schools.

There were no blacks on either the city council or school board in 1965 when Selma made history as the violent starting point of the 54-mile peaceful march to the capital city of Montgomery to press for the passage of the Voting Rights Act. The issue for blacks then, as well as now, has been control. Blacks have little control over Selma's school system even though 70 percent of its students are black. And while Selma's black citizens comprise a 52 percent majority of the city's 27,000 population, they have never gained control of city hall. According to black Council-man **WILLIAM KING,** Selma is "still two separate and paranoid communities, even though the blatancy of racism has gone."

In 1988, mayor Smitherman was challenged by a black candidate, city councilman CLEO MANN and one other candidate but he won 54 percent of the vote. Whites have not only held on to the mayor's seat, but they have also maintained a five-to-four majority on the city council through the at-large election of the council president. Control of the council is crucial, because the council and the mayor appoint the school board.

Meanwhile, as blacks continue to demonstrate in front of city hall, the school board has been negotiating with Roussell to accept a financial settlement to leave his post—so far, he has resisted these offers. As far as our children are concerned," says Chestnut, "we are right back where we started from."

Like Selma, Like Boston

The racial tension that has grown out of the Boston School Committee's firing of that city's first black school superintendent, **LAVAL S. WILSON,** is nothing new in a city known for the violence that followed its implementation of court-ordered busing in 1974. The School Committee voted on February 13 to buy out the remaining 16 months of Superintendent Wilson's contract. The total cost of the buyout, in a financially-strapped system, is estimated to be $200,000. The vote was 7-1, with the four black members and one white member of the committee walking out before the vote. Wilson was hired to the Boston post in 1985. He attended a Rockefeller Foundation program in 1970 to train minority school superintendents, and became the first black superintendent in three cities before his Boston appointment: Berkeley, California; Hempstead, N.Y.; and Rochester, N.Y.

Wilson has been accused of having a confrontational style, of aggressively pursuing other jobs since 1987, and of failing to improve low test scores and high dropout rates. The committee voted 7-6 in Wilson's June 1989 professional review to place him under a recurring six-month review based on ten performance criteria. Boston schools have had eight superintendents in nineteen years.

Both Wilson and the committee members who boycotted the vote charge that the performance criteria weren't used in deciding on his dismissal. Boston NAACP President **LOUIS ELISHA** called the firing "a blatant act of racism." White school committee member **JOHN GRADY** called it a "lynching," and black committee member **JOHN O'BRYANT** said "there are those who can't deal with a strong black man as the leader of Boston's schools."

Of the 55,000 students in the city's schools, 75 percent are minority (black, Hispanic, and Asian). The four black members of the School Committee have demanded that, as representatives of the minority community, they should have a voice in selecting Wilson's interim replacement. Boston had an all-white, five-member board before installing a 13-member board in 1983. Four of the 13 members are elected at-large. Local observers speculate that Wilson's firing may become an issue in School Committee elections this year.

Southern Black Mayors Receiving Leadership Training

In an effort to provide technical assistance to black mayors and top administrative officials of small cities and towns, the Washington-based National Forum for Black Public Administrators (NFBPA) has established the Leadership Institute for Small Municipalities. Since few resources are available to help black may-

ors untangle the problems of governing small municipalities, the institute's training program focuses on seven skill areas: grantsmanship; economic development skills; team building; negotiation; management and administration; leadership; and image building and the ethics of holding office.

The institute conducts its training at local universities in five weekend sessions spread over ten weeks. Typically, the participants are part-time and/or unpaid mayors with full-time jobs outside city hall. One such elected official is **GEORGE BARNES,** two-term mayor of Wabbaseka, Arkansas, population 428. Barnes, who is also on the town's school board, is a part-time Baptist minister and a full-time salesman at an automobile tire company in nearby Pine Bluff.

The median size of the communities in which these officials work is 1,200 people. With the passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965, a steady stream of blacks have come to occupy the city halls of small southern towns. **Alabama, Arkansas, and Mississippi, for example, now have 85 black mayors among them. Yet many of these officials are inexperienced. "It's unreasonable to expect a person to automatically know how to run a city after having no prior electoral experience," says QUENTIN LAWSON, executive director of NFBPA. "Our position is that if technical assistance is not provided, at the end of a four-year-term, a black mayor is likely to be no better than his white predecessor. As a result, the hopes and aspirations of his or her black constituents will be frustrated and they may revert to political apathy."**

The first set of training workshops began in October 1989, and the program is expected to continue for at least three years. Officials from Alabama and Mississippi were in the first group. These lower Delta Valley mayors face the same challenges: low educational levels, an unskilled work force, declining economies, and what has come to be known as the hourglass phenomenon—a declining population in which only the very young and very old remain. The first group of graduates (10 mayors and 14 administrators) completed their training in December 1989. Twenty-four additional mayors and administrative officials from Mississippi and Arkansas graduated March 25.

According to Dr. ARCHIE MORRIS III, project director of the Leadership Institute, economic development is one of the most pressing training needs because "most small towns are experiencing problems in raising sufficient revenues and providing jobs for their citizens." Dr. Morris also notes that the most recent participants showed a keen interest in the ethics of holding office and have recommended that the institute address conflict-of-interest situations.

Over the next three years, the Leadership Institute expects to train 90 black mayors and their top administrative staff in 10 additional states that have more than 10 black mayors apiece in: Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, South Carolina, North Carolina, Missouri, Oklahoma, Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois. The Leadership Institute is funded under a $450,000 grant from the W.W. Kellogg Foundation. Established in 1983, NFBPA now has 2,300 members. Its stated mission is to "strengthen the capabilities of black public administrators and to promote the appointment of blacks to executive positions in local governments."

Updates on Recent TrendLetter Stories

• **CLARENCE THOMAS was confirmed March 6 by a voice vote of the Senate to a judgeship on the U.S. District Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit Court.** The only opposition expressed during the floor debate came from Democratic senators **HOWARD METZENBAUM** (Ohio) and **DAVID PRYOR** (Arkansas) who criticized Thomas's handling of age discrimination cases during his eight-year tenure as chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). Thomas's confirmation was expected to be controversial (see Trendletter, volume 17 nos. 8 & 9, 1989) because of objections arising from his expressed disapproval of affirmative action and perceived lack of vigilance as EEOC chief in processing age and race discrimination claims. However, the Judiciary Committee sent his nomination to the Senate floor with a 12-to-1 favorable vote. **A concern of some black and public interest groups opposed to his confirmation was that the appellate judgeship could pave the way for Thomas's nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court.**

• **JOHN DUNNE was confirmed as assistant attorney general for civil rights (see Political Trendletter, January 1990) on March 9.** The Senate Judiciary Committee approved the former New York state senator's nomination in a voice vote a day earlier. His Senate confirmation has been greeted with dismay by civil rights leaders who argue that President Bush should have appointed a black person with more civil rights experience rather than a white environmental lawyer.

Across the Nation

ARIZONA: COY PAYNE, sworn in on March 8 as mayor of Chandler (about 30 miles southeast of Phoenix), has become the first black executive of an Arizona city. Payne is a retired junior high school principal who previously served as vice-mayor and member of the Chandler City Council. He defeated white councilwoman JANE DuCOMB by a two-to-one margin on January 23, garnering 65 percent of the vote. What is unusual about Payne's victory is that it occurred in a city of approximately 81,000 residents with a black population of less than five percent.

The election became, in part, a referendum on development. DuComb ran as a pro-development candidate while Payne favors slow growth for Chandler, which has already expanded to almost three times its 1980 population of 29,673. Payne supports limiting airport expansion, for example.

That Payne won where he did is also surprising. Chandler is located in East Valley, a region with a large Mormon population that is perceived to be politically conservative. East Valley is also the home of architect JULIAN SANDERS, who led the successful movement last year to place the state's Martin Luther King holiday on hold until the matter is decided in a referendum in next November's election.

Including Payne, Arizona now has 12 black elected officials. They include three state legislators, three city council members, and five education officials.

CALIFORNIA: After serving 14 years in the California State Assembly, Los Angeles Democrat MAXINE WATERS is running for the 29th congressional district seat of retiring U.S. Rep. AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, a 14-term Democrat. At 82 years of age, Hawkins is the most senior black legislator in Congress. First elected in 1962, he rose through the ranks and by 1984 had become chairman of the important House Education and Labor Committee. Hawkins was the prime mover of the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act passed in 1977, and has been instrumental in the passage of numerous education and child development bills. **Following Hawkins' example, Waters, who worked in the Head Start program before being elected to the state assembly in 1976, has vowed in her campaign to make education "number one on our agenda."**

The 29th district, which gave presidential candidate **MICHAEL DUKAKIS** 80 percent of its vote in 1988, is considered the most heavily Democratic district in California. It includes part of the City of Los Angeles, whose Watts community was the scene of one of the most destructive riots of the 1960s. Living conditions for Watts residents have improved little since then, with continuing high rates of poverty, crime, and unemployment.

A forcefully articulate and aggressive leader, Waters has become a major political force in the state. She was the first woman elected to chair the Democratic Caucus, one of the highest leadership positions in the state assembly. Her legislative initiatives have resulted in the divestment of state funds from corporations doing business in South Africa and in the creation of the nation's first statewide child abuse prevention training program. And as chair of the Assembly Ways and Means Subcommittee on State Administration, Waters helped establish minority and women set-asides for state procurement contracts.

If elected, Waters should have little trouble adjusting to Washington politics. She is a member of the Democratic National Committee and the National Women's Political Caucus and was also an outspoken supporter of JESSE JACKSON in the 1984 and 1988 presidential campaigns. In the June 5 primary, Waters will face three little known Democrats: **LIONEL ALLEN**, a naval veteran, **TWAIN WILSON**, a businessman, and **TED ANDROMIDAS**, a political consultant.

MARYLAND: Former Detroit Congressman CHARLES DIGGS has announced that he will enter the September 11 primary for a Prince Georges County seat in the Maryland House of Delegates. Black incumbent GLORIA LAWLAH is giving up her seat to run for the state senate. Diggs, a Democrat, was a founding member and first chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, having served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1955 until his resignation in 1980, when he was convicted for taking payroll kickbacks from his congressional employees. Following his conviction, he served seven months of a three-year prison sentence.

Diggs once presided over the House District Committee, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa he was an ardent foe of South Africa's system of apartheid. He also helped found Trans-Africa, the black-American foreign affairs lobby. Before his tenure in Congress, where he represented an inner-city Detroit district, Diggs had served two terms as a Michigan state senator. A licenced mortician, since leaving Congress he has acquired four funeral homes in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

Declaring that he only wants the seat for one term, Diggs says his main reason for running in what promises to be a crowded field, "is to be in a strategic position in Annapolis during the reapportionment process in 1991 and 1992." He urges black state legislators across the nation to prepare to participate fully in the upcoming redistricting struggle. Although Maryland is not expected to gain any congressional seats after reapportionment, state and local election districts will certainly be redrawn. Prince Georges County, whose black population has grown dramatically over the last decade, offers real opportunities for the creation of a majority black congressional district. The county lies in the 5th district, currently represented by five-term Democrat STENY HOYER, who is white. Hoyer chairs the House Democratic Caucus and ranks fourth in the House majority leadership.

OHIO: Black Republican J. KENNETH BLACKWELL has resigned his post in the Bush administration to run for Congress from Ohio's 1st district in Cincinnati. Blackwell, who was deputy undersecretary for intergovernmental relations at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, previously served as Cincinnati's mayor and for six terms as city council member. He is pursuing the seat of retiring Democratic Rep. THOMAS LUKEN, who has represented the district since 1976.

The 1st district, which encompasses western Cincinnati and suburban Hamilton County, is only 18 percent black. By appealing to a diverse cross-section of voters, Luken has been elected to seven terms in a district that has supported Republicans in presidential elections since 1980. In 1988, President **GEORGE BUSH** received 63 percent of the district's vote. Cincinnati's blacks (40 percent of the district's vote comes from Cincinnati), conservative suburban German Catholics, and whites from rural Appalachia have all contributed to Luken's victories.

Blackwell is likely to attract black voters as well as a large portion of the district's conservative white voters. Nevertheless, his opposition will be formidable. In the November general election, Blackwell will probably face Cincinnati's current Democratic Mayor CHARLES LUKEN, the son of the retiring congressman.

Louis Martin, the Godfather

As Its First Chairman, Martin Guided the Joint Center Through Difficult Beginnings, and for 20 Years His Counsel Has Proven Invaluable

by David C. Ruffin

While many were present at the Joint Center's birth, it was the hand of Louis Martin that guided the fledgling institution through its earliest years. Martin's stature as the nation's most politically experienced black leader at that time made him the natural choice to head the Joint Center's board of governors.

Born in Shelbyville, Tennessee, Martin graduated from the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor in 1934. In 1944, he gained rare political experience as assistant publicity director for Franklin Roosevelt's reelection campaign. He took over, in 1947, as editor-in-chief of the *Chicago Defender,* a crusading black newspaper; it was a position he held for 12 years. Martin established close relationships with leading black scholars, activists, and political figures.

He returned to politics in 1960 as part of John F. Kennedy's presidential campaign team. Just a few weeks before the November election, Martin convinced Robert Kennedy, who was running his brother's campaign, to call Judge Oscar Mitchell and persuade him to release Martin Luther King from an Atlanta jail. King, who had been arrested for joining students during a sit-in at segregated shops and restaurants across the South, was freed a day later. This behind-the-scenes maneuvering was typical Louis Martin and reflected his negotiating skill.

The same year, Martin was appointed deputy chairman of the Democratic National Committee, a position he held until 1969. During his tenure he served as liaison between the black community and the White House. Both presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson relied heavily on his advice concerning issues affecting black Americans. By mid-decade, Martin had become known as the "Godfather of black politics."

To the Ballot Box—March!

It became clear to Martin that with the passage of the Voting Rights Act, black political participation would pass from the civil rights movement to electoral politics. The number of black elected officials had jumped from about 300 in 1964 to more than 1,200 in 1969. "Those were exciting days," Martin now reflects, "yet despite all the political activity, there was no institution that could provide factual data and political analysis. There wasn't a place in Washington that a black mayor from a small Southern town could call up to get the answer to the question: Where can I get some money to pave the streets?"

When noted black social psychologist Kenneth Clark and a core of leading black politicians, intellectuals, and activists created the Joint Center in 1970, Louis Martin was the obvious choice to chair the board of the new organization. With major funding from the Ford Foundation, the Joint Center became a non-partisan clearinghouse for political information and activities that could develop a clear blueprint for sustained political participation.

Two early items on the Joint Center's agenda were to promote black voter participation and to provide technical assistance to newly elected black office holders—both part of Martin's dream for the future. In his view, working for political progress "in the courts with judges and in the streets with marchers" had already become a conventional road. "After the Voting Rights Act," he recalls, "we learned that we could mobilize our own power through the electoral process and that the most successful march a person could take was to the ballot box."

With its focus on electoral politics, the Joint Center was "drawing a bigger circle," as Martin is fond of saying, to expand the possibilities for political participation. "Louis Martin is an includer," says Eleanor Farrar, who was one of the Joint Center's first board members. "His skills at bringing people together around ideas and issues were particularly important."

Lunch on the Mountaintop

In 1972, when the Joint Center was looking for a president to head the organization, it was decided to invite Eddie N. Williams, then vice president for public affairs at the University of Chicago, to take up the post. But Williams needed convincing. That was a job for Louis Martin—the great persuader. In the course of a lunch meeting, Martin remembers, "I told Eddie that he would have the freedom to use his creativity to shape a unique political institution, and we would support him." Martin informed him too of the considerable financial resources the Ford Foundation had already committed to the organization. The venue for the tete-a-tete was the Press Room high atop one of Chicago's finer hotels, the St. Clair. "I took him to the mountaintop and showed him the future," says Martin. That was enough. Williams was convinced, and he has been with the Joint Center ever since.

Martin takes great pride in the Joint Center's achievements and has remained a member of its board of governors. To this day he thrives on talking politics. More often than not, he ends conversations with the words that have become his own signature: "You are a great American." ■

Mr. Ruffin is the editor of *Focus* magazine.

A History of the Joint Center 1970–1990

For 20 Years, the Joint Center Has Led the Way, Through Its Policy Research, to Make American Political, Economic, and Social Institutions More Responsive to the Concerns of African-Americans

by Darlene Clark Hine

The twenty-year history of the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies is as much an overview of the transition blacks have made from protest to politics as a chronicle of the creation and evolution of a unique institution. Created by black intellectuals, professionals, and politicians with initial funding from the Ford Foundation, the Joint Center has eased blacks' transition from civil rights protesters to participants in mainstream politics. At a critical juncture in the quest for full participation in American society, the Joint Center helped devise strategies for changing political and economic realities.

The successes of the civil rights movement are indisputable. New laws, effective enforcement, Supreme Court decisions, and the growth of a national consensus against racial inequality helped to change the legal status of black Americans. Many members of the black community poised to take advantage of the new educational and employment opportunities soon became part of an expanding black middle class.

The political landscape, too, was changing, mainly because of passage in 1965 of the Voting Rights Act. Assured of federal protection, thousands of black citizens across the South voted for the first time. This upsurge of political activity gave rise to a new presence—the black elected official. In 1964, the year before the Voting Rights Act, only about 300 blacks held elective office. By September 1969 the figure had leaped to more than 1,200. Many of these freshly minted state and local officials, school board members, county commissioners, and their supporters were eager to develop networks and make contacts for professional and moral support, or simply to learn more about the political process and how to use it to benefit their constituencies. At the same time, other black leaders, intellectuals, activists, and foundation executives foresaw the need to forge a collective awareness of politics as the means of achieving black economic and social progress.

In 1969 Kenneth Clark, the distinguished black social psychologist who was president of the Metropolitan Applied Research Center (MARC) and one of the founders of the Joint Center, captured this increased emphasis on political participation. He declared, "Elected Negro officials are now the only civil rights leaders who are...elected by their people to speak for them."

The Doors Open

Two conferences—one in Chicago in 1967 and the other in Washington, D.C., in 1969—brought many of those officials together and laid the groundwork for a new institution responsive to the needs of that new cadre of black leaders. The Washington conference was attended by more than 250 elected officials representing all regions of the country and most levels of office.

Both conferences were successful, and by the end of the Washington meeting expectations among black elected officials ran high. They sensed that the time to move ahead had come, and were convinced that what they needed was a permanent organization to enhance their effectiveness as representatives of their constituents and leaders of their communities. On April 20, 1970, the Ford Foundation, which had funded both conferences and encouraged exploratory talks about creating an organization to support the new black leadership, agreed to provide a two-year grant of $820,000 to establish such an organization.

On July 1, 1970, the newly christened Joint Center for Political Studies opened its offices in downtown Washington, D.C., under the *joint* sponsorship of MARC and Howard University. MARC provided oversight on program activities and Howard was responsible for the Center's fiscal affairs. Frank D. Reeves, political activist, civil rights attorney, and professor at Howard Law School, was installed as executive director. The original board of governors consisted of two representatives of MARC, Kenneth Clark and Eleanor Farrar (vice president of MARC and director of its Washington office); two representatives of Howard University, President James Cheek and Vice President for Academic Affairs Andrew Billingsley; and Louis Martin, editor in chief of the *Chicago Defender,* who was elected board chairman. Best known for his years of behind-the-scenes political activities as a member of the Democratic National Committee and of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, Martin was a critical link between white politicians and the black community.

Dr. Darlene Clark Hine is the John A. Hannah Professor of History at Michigan State University and author of the forthcoming history, *The Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, 1970-1990: A Catalyst for Change.*

During the early years, fulfillment of the mission consisted of much hands-on training and customized technical assistance. By 1974, a multiyear grant from the U.S. Civil Service Commission enabled the Joint Center to conduct training sessions on administration, planning, and budgeting for black elected officials in various regions of the country. Frequently the sessions provided facts and figures about new—or not so new—federal programs for which local jurisdictions were eligible. "How to" sessions explained the mysteries of applying for federal grants, and many a council member discovered that understanding a city budget did not require a business school degree.

Another Joint Center activity aimed at informing, assisting, and supporting black elected officials in their search for influence and success was the compilation and publication of the *National Roster of Black Elected Officials*. The *Roster*, published first in 1970 and annually since then, lists the name, address, title of office, date of election, and term of office of every black elected official in the United States. A similar Joint Center publication that serves to keep black elected officials in touch is the *Guide to Black Politics*, a quadrennial handbook for delegates to the Democratic and Republican national conventions.

By early 1981, the Joint Center was on the road to a major transformation into a public policy institution to engage business and labor leaders, scholars, journalists, and public officials—black and white—in research and discussion of vital issues affecting the black population and the society as a whole.

From the beginning, the Joint Center encouraged black officeholders to participate actively in national organizations devoted to their levels of office and to form black caucuses where appropriate. The Congressional Black Caucus, consisting of all black members of the House of Representatives, came into existence at the same time as the Joint Center. The six other caucuses of black elected officials—covering local, county, state, and federal offices—came on the scene during the 1970s with the active support and assistance of the Joint Center and have remained in close contact ever since.

The history of the Joint Center's political publications mirrors the history of the ideologies, strategies, and informational needs of black politicians. Publications such as *The Making of a Black Mayor* by John Dean (1973) and *Municipal Budgeting: A Primer for Elected Officials* by Jesse Burkhead and Paul Bringewatt (1977) addressed the needs of black officials for basic information on political techniques and management. Some of the more recent publications, however, such as *Strategies for Mobilizing Black Voters*, edited by Thomas E. Cavanagh (1987), and *Tom Bradley's Campaigns for Governor*, by Thomas F. Pettigrew and Denise A. Alston (1988), pay considerable attention to the impact of the black electorate and to the kinds of political strategies that win support from both black and white voters.

While the Joint Center's chief executive, Frank Reeves (1970-1972), concentrated on making the Joint Center known within the black community, its second (and current) executive, Eddie Williams, has been committed to building a permanent institution. Williams, a past assistant to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey and a former State Department officer, came to the Joint Center from the University of Chicago where he was vice president for public affairs and director of the Center for Policy Studies. A former journalist with a keen interest in communications and media relations, Williams began his tenure by creating *Focus* magazine.

Free-Standing and Independent

Williams believed that the Joint Center's continued dependence on Howard University limited its development. He also realized that future expansion of the organization would require diversification of its funding base. He began to look more carefully at opportunities to secure contracts and grants from federal agencies, foundations, and major corporations. The board of governors agreed with Williams that the Joint Center should become an independent entity. In 1976 the Joint Center for Political Studies was incorporated in the District of Columbia as a free-standing, tax-exempt institution.

Williams strengthened the Joint Center in other ways as well. He enlarged the research and publications programs, recruited Eleanor Farrar from her position at MARC to become vice president of the Joint Center in 1974, and carefully cultivated a staff of highly trained researchers, analysts, and administrators. He engaged outside experts as fellows, authors, and advisors. He encouraged his colleagues to participate in professional meetings, present papers and lectures, respond to media requests, and develop new ideas and programs. The Joint Center's election coverage became more sophisticated, and its political analysis attracted national attention and respect.

By the late 1970s it had become evident that although the number and expertise of black elected officials had steadily increased, this did not translate easily into public policies that improved living conditions within the black community. As a result, black Americans showed a marked shift in their priorities and concerns. No longer were they troubled by lack of access to the ballot or to public accommodations. Now aspirations turned to achieving economic and social progress. Moreover, a host of social ills threatened to render illusory the gains made in the political arena. These changes in the perceptions and needs of black Americans, along with a more conservative national mood, convinced the Joint Center that it needed to reexamine its priorities and programs and, where appropriate, redirect its efforts. The Joint Center solicited the views

(Continued on back page)

A History of the Joint Center: 1970–1990

(Continued from page 7)

and advice of many individuals inside and outside the organization.

A Full-Fledged Think-Tank

By early 1981, the Joint Center was on the road to a major transformation into a public policy institution. Williams described the changed emphasis as an attempt "to engage business and labor leaders, scholars, journalists, and public officials—black and white—in research and discussion of vital issues affecting the black population and the society as a whole; to provide a forum for appraising policy alternatives and for shaping public policies at all levels of government; and to disseminate findings and recommendations to a broad and diverse audience."

The transformation from a technical assistance organization to a public policy institution sparked some apprehensions among black elected officials. Some feared any de-emphasis of the assistance so long provided. But Williams reassured them that because of their special role in public policy, they would continue to be both a special constituency and a unique source of ideas for the Joint Center's research agenda.

Changes were taking place, meanwhile, among black elected officials themselves. The pragmatic black politicians of the 1980s, adept in the art and practice of cross-over politics, scarcely resembled their counterparts of the 1960s. They came from much stronger educational and career backgrounds and most were ready and able to appeal to voters across racial lines. The recent elections of David Dinkins as mayor of New York City and L. Douglas Wilder as governor of Virginia confirm this assessment.

What also helped to reassure black elected officials was the continuing close relationship between the Joint Center and their own caucuses. National Policy Institutes continued to be cosponsored by the Joint Center and those organizations. In fact, the national meetings have been regularized; they are now convened every four years in the winter preceding a presidential election. What has changed is the decreased emphasis at these meetings on skills training and the increased emphasis on public policy issues. This change is also reflected in the creation of the office of the National Policy Institute (NPI) at the Joint Center to provide assistance to black elected officials. NPI is the Joint Center's permanent link to black elected officials.

The Joint Center continues to enlarge its scope and vision. During the 1980s it greatly enhanced its research program in economic policy studies and in international affairs. Today the Joint Center's work is increasingly grounded in the belief that the fulcrum of black economic advancement is the distribution of resources and economic opportunities. The immutable connection in American society between political participation and the distribution of economic benefits is well established. Yet, as the Joint Center's research staff has documented, the widening gap in economic well-being between blacks and whites is among the more glaring evidences of society's unfulfilled commitment to equal opportunity.

As one looks back over the first twenty years of the Joint Center, what stands out are the contributions the organization has made in two important areas: the many different types of assistance it has provided to black elected officials, black leaders, and other members of its core constituency; and the perspective on public policy issues which it has introduced into the national dialogue. The Joint Center has demonstrated that blacks are a major force in American politics and that the society and its institutions must become more aware of and responsive to the concerns of African Americans. The Joint Center's past contributions and successes put it on a promising course for future distinguished service in the national interest. ■

FOCUS
Joint Center for Political Studies®
1301 Pa. Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 626-3500

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

Postmaster: Form 3547 requested

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify FOCUS of any change of address or title. YOU MUST ATTACH THE MAILING LABEL FROM THE BACK COVER when writing about service or change of address. No change can be made without this information. Allow 6 weeks for change of address to take effect. Thank you.

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 6958
Washington, D.C.

26063
SRI
Acquisitions Editor
Congressional Info Svc, Inc.
4520 East-West Hwy.
Bethesda, MD 20814